MILITARY CHAPLAINS'

REVIEW

1979

Military Chaplains' Review

Military Chaplains' Review

PREFACE

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is designed as a medium in which those interested in the military chaplaincy can share with chaplains the product of their experience and research. We welcome articles which are directly concerned with supporting and strengthening chaplains professionally. Preference will be given to those articles having lasting value as reference material.

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is published quarterly. The opinions reflected in each article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of the Chief of Chaplains or the Department of the Army. When used in this publication, the terms "he," "him," and "his" are intended to include both the masculine and feminine genders; any exceptions to this will be so noted.

Articles should be submitted in duplicate, double spaced, to the Editor, Military Chaplains' Review, United States Army Chaplain Board, Fort Wadsworth, Staten Island, N.Y. 10305. Articles should be approximately 8 to 18 pages in length and, when appropriate, should be carefully footnoted. Detailed editorial guidelines are available from the editor on request.

EDITOR

Chaplain (LTC) John J. Hoogland May 1971 — June 1974
Chaplain (LTC) Joseph E. Galle III July 1974 — September 1976
Chaplain (LTC) Rodger R. Venzke October 1976 —

A Good Reader Makes A Good Book

I have often used this space to call your attention to specific articles in an issue, to highlight a special theme, or to offer laurels to contributing authors. It occurred to me, however, that my special thanks to you, the interested and responsive reader, has been long overdue.

Many of you have written regarding articles, a special issue, or the entire concept of the journal. We have never printed letters to the editor, not because we don't value your comments, but because the infrequency of a quarterly publication would tend to make such letters appear out-of-date. Nevertheless, we have been pleased by so many of your comments. The following excerpts from a few of your recent letters will demonstrate what I mean:

"I enjoy and benefit from reading your publication"

"I just finished the [last] issue of the *Military Chaplains' Review* and wish to share how much I enjoyed reading it. I certainly gained insight . . . ."

"I want to commend you for your fine quarterly . . . . the articles have been highly readable, well written, of lasting interest to the military chaplain as well as the civilian pastor . . . ."

"I always anticipate with excitement the next issue and frequently share the periodical with other professionals on post. They are impressed without exception."

"Thanks for continuing the outstanding tradition of distributing noteworthy articles to us."

"I was very much impressed by the depth of insight, scholarship and overall scope of the articles . . . ."

"Just got the latest copy of the *MCR* . . . . the best practical professional journal anywhere! Splendid!

Obviously, critical comments are also received. Though they have been extremely rare, we regard them with equal seriousness and attempt to offer reading which is stimulating and meaningful to as many of you as possible. Ultimately, you, the readers, determine the value of this journal and I'm grateful for your continued assistance in its development.

The following quotation from the works of Ralph Waldo Emerson seems appropriate:

> 'Tis the good reader that makes the good book; in every book he finds passages which seem confidences or asides hidden from all else and unmistakably meant for his ear; the profit of books is according to the sensibility of the reader; the profoundest thought or passion sleeps as in a mine, until it is discovered by an equal mind and heart.

ORRIS E. KELLY
Chaplain (Major General), USA
Chief of Chaplains

Military, Chaplains' Review

Excellence in Preaching: A Neglected Art?*

Chaplain (MAJ) Charles W. Hedrick, Ph. D.

The pastoral function is multi-faceted and complex. The pastor is teacher, preacher, administrator, counselor, fund-raiser *et ad infinitum ad absurdum!* He is expected to be "all (these) things to all people." Unfortunately not every pastor is *that* versatile. Pastors, like all of us, have strong points and weak points. Whereas one pastor may excell as a fund-raiser but be weak as an administrator, another pastor is a strong administrator but a weak fund-raiser. Most churches have learned to live with the reality of talent inequity among pastors, since it is generally too expensive to hire several full-time specialists to reduce the complexity of the pastoral function. So they forgive their pastor's short-comings and rejoice in their pastor's capabilities—or at least *some* do! And pastors likewise eventually either come to terms with their own "feet of clay," or have nervous breakdowns. Such compromises are necessary and healthy.

Compromise, however, is *not* acceptable in the scholarly quality of the pastor's preaching ministry. In this area churches should expect *and demand* the best from their pastor—nor should they settle for anything less! No pastor with a clear conscience may forgive the lack of scholarship in the preaching ministry and attempt to compensate for it in other ways. One can't, for example, make up for a lack of scholarship by volume and emotion, though some do try. Behind every sermon should lie hours of preparation in the study.

The pastor should be first and foremost a "minister of the word." The motto of the U.S. Army Chaplaincy expresses it well. The pastor, like the chaplain, is "to bring men to God and God to men." Of course the pastor does this in every aspect of ministry. Ideally everything done relates in some way to this goal. However, there is one particular moment in the life of the church when the pastor's role as "minister of the word" comes

Chaplain Hedrick, a Southern Baptist and member of the Army Reserve, is currently serving as an instructor at Wagner College, SI, NY. He received his Ph. D. in New Testament studies at Claremont Graduate School in 1977 and served as a lecturer in Religion at the same institution, 1977-78. He has served in several pastorates, held various academic appointments, and is the author of numerous articles.

into sharpest and clearest focus; it occurs when the people are addressed in the preaching services of the church. This moment is the "ministry of the word" *par excellence!* It is during these few minutes that he succeeds or fails as a minister of the word.

It is true that there are many characteristics of "quality" preaching, and preaching like beauty probably does lie to some extent in the eye of the individual beholder: some like it hot and some like it detached and cool; some like it short and some like it long; some like it loud and some like it soft; some like it sweet and others like it abrasive. In other words, quality preaching may come in different styles. However, there is one characteristic that, if absent, turns preaching into the equivalent of "banging a noisy gong and clanging loud cymbals," *i.e.* an exercise full of sound and fury yet signifying nothing. The *sine qua non* of quality preaching is its excellence in scholarship *i.e.* its carefully prepared and solid content. Scholarly preaching is not pedantic, dry, ivory-tower academia that jumps about over the heads of the people like so much static electricity. On the contrary, it is preaching that reflects a broad knowledge of secondary literature on a subject, detailed and careful study of the primary biblical texts, a sensitivity to the needs of people and an awareness of the text's impact on the modern situation. It includes organization and careful preparation of the sermon with due consideration given to its "literary" character. It is, above all, relevant to the human situation.

Scholarship is not a bad word. It is not, as I have heard it denounced from some pulpits, synonymous with anti-evangelism, non-belief in the Bible, non-faith and an assortment of other negative associations. A scholar is either a student who *is acquiring* knowledge in a given area or a student who *has acquired* sufficient knowledge in a given area to be considered by his peers as a specialist. In short it describes a "learning" person who may be considered at some point to be a "learned" person. In this sense every pastor should be a scholar and every sermon should reflect careful scholarship. Put another way, every sermon should reflect the results of the pastor's "learning."

How does a pastor achieve quality in his preaching? What is it that gives the sermon a "scholarly" character? These difficult questions admit of no simple answer. Like it or not, the character of a sermon is inextricably related to the character of the preacher: a scholarly sermon is only preached by a scholarly pastor; an uninformed sermon is preached by the uninformed pastor; an ignorant sermon is only preached by the ignorant pastor (oh yes, we do have them!). The point is that the sermon rises no higher than the source from which it flows. It becomes what the pastor creates in the study. So when one talks about the characteristics of quality preaching one immediately focuses on the preacher. One is not describing the strengths and deficiencies of an address or a written essay; one is actually criticizing the scholarly character of the preacher as well as the product of the preacher's scholarship. The preacher's intelligence, study habits, wisdom, maturity and language skills can scarcely be exempt from a

critique of the preacher's product because that product like a mirror reflects the character of the one that forged it. In short, the sermon is a very personal projection of one's own self. This observation, if not self-evident, should become apparent in the discussion that follows.

The quality of preaching can be measured against three canons: reading broadens and deepens one's preaching ministry; to minister the word is to deal with the text; concern for people lessens the intensity of the religious vision.

I. Reading Broadens and Deepens One's Preaching Ministry

The pastor that does not read extensively and widely will never do quality preaching. There simply will not be sufficient resource material on which to build quality sermons. Sermon style and content, because of their novelty, may hold the interest of the people for awhile but soon the reservoir will run dry and preaching will be repetitive and superficial. A congregation like a river "rises no higher than its source." Repetitive and superficial preaching actually suppresses individual growth and discourages learning! The best that such a pastor can hope for is that the people will not suddenly "hear" for the first time what they have been listening to. Frankly, it is only the indolence of the people that enables such a preacher to retain his job. The occasional member of the congregation who suddenly does become aware of the lack of learning in the preaching ministry of the pastor will find another church home where quality preaching is done, or find other subjects to occupy an idle mind during the preaching hour, or develop other interests and slowly drop out of the life of the church.

Books document the results of human experience and learning. The pastor who does not take advantage of this resource is restricting the congregation to a narrow frame of reference, *i.e.* to the preacher's own life experiences and unread wisdom. Now life experience and cracker-barrel wisdom are valid resources for preaching and God knows we could use a little more common sense in the pulpit, but restricting preaching resources to *these alone* condemns the people to the preacher's own narrow brand of provincialism. All the people hear from the cracker-barrel preacher is the same old thing uncreatively presented a limited number of different ways.

What a preacher reads is as important as reading itself. Put another way, "poor reading material begets poor preaching resources," and scarcely improves the scholarly quality of one's preaching ministry. The minister who confines reading to the sports page, the *Readers Digest,* collections of sermons by W.A. Criswell (or others) and the Bible can scarcely expect to do quality preaching! One must discipline oneself to maintain good reading habits in a diversified selection of literature. The wider the range of one's reading interests the more knowledgeable, interesting and edifying are one's sermons. One's reading diet should expose one to new ideas that challenge one's thinking and increase one's learning. By reading such materials, both the preacher and the congregation will move out of a

religious backwater into the mainstream of life in the twentieth century. To fail to read is to become an anachronism, a fighter for dead issues out of touch with the contemporary world.

The pastor who has the attitude of the writer of the book of Ecclesiastes (12:12) that "of making many books there is no end, and much study is a weariness of the flesh" probably ought to find some means to fulfill a sense of ministry other than the pastorate. Books and reading are basic and essential tools for the pastor who aspires to the "ministry of the word." Books for the minister compare to the mason's trowel, the physician's stethoscope and the engineer's slide rule. If a minister fails to use these "tools of the trade," that minister is guilty of malpractice in the exercise of ministry, and should be held accountable by the congregation.

In many cases the "ripoff" by an unprepared pastor of those who come to learn goes unrecognized. Unread and narrow pastors are preaching shallow and provincial sermons to indiscriminating and unsuspecting congregations and learning has become a forgotten art in the church. This may seem a harsh judgment, but in many cases it is an honest assessment of the situation. Ministers who themselves are not learning cannot hope to make learners (*i.e.* disciples) out of those they teach. They merely reinforce provincialism, ignorance, and mediocrity.

II. To Minister the Word is to Deal with the Text

Preaching is a serious engagement of minds in which the congregation is addressed by a text through its interpreter, the pastor. This exchange between text and congregation involves the ear, the eye, the heart, the mouth, and particularly the mind! Without the interaction of mind *with the meaning of the text* there is no communication, or put another way, if in the engagement of minds the meaning of the text is not communicated, it should not be called preaching. Preaching, therefore, may be described as communicating the meaning of a text.

In the language of the church one might express it differently. Preaching is communicating the "word of God." In the few minutes set aside by the church each week for a consideration of the "written word," *i.e.*, the biblical text, there is an opportunity for one to be addressed by the "living word," by the "spoken word" of the pastor. "To minister the word," therefore, means that one deals with the text, for it is in the clarification and application of the "written word" that one is addressed by the "living and eternal" word of God.

To deal with the text means to approach it at two levels. First the pastor must determine what it originally *meant* in the context of the writer and the first readers and then wrestle with what the text *means* 1900+ years later in the modern situation. Unless the preacher knows what it *meant* it will not be possible to overcome the years separating the modern reader from the ancient author and the original situation so as to score the same point in the contemporary situation.

4

To understand what the text *meant* is to read it with comprehension in its original context. This is not an easy or simple exercise. It requires: a general broad knowledge of the period during which the text emerged; an ability to read the language in which the text is written (it is not clear how any pastor can expect to understand the finer nuances of a text, and hence its full meaning, if forced to read it only in English translation); a detailed linguistic and conceptual analysis of the text; an ability to reconstruct the historical context from hints given in the total document in which the text occurs; a sensitivity to literary forms and a knowledge of their life setting; an ability to place one's self in the shoes of the author and the first readers and to see the text with their eyes; and finally it requires some awareness of the secondary literature on the text, *i.e.* how have others understood the meaning of the text. These are just *some* of the issues that arise when one deals carefully and honestly with a text.

The pastor that has had no training in the historical critical methodology is at a decided disadvantage. By being unaware of this methodology that is *essential* to achieving an understanding of what the text meant, one runs the risk of "modernizing" the text in every sermon preached; that is, one risks reading one's own modern situation into the text. Too often the conservative pastor, "playing his theology close to the chest," has so thoroughly "modernized" the text that the point scored in antiquity by the original author bears no resemblance at all to the interpretation of the modern pastor in the Sunday morning preaching hour! Instead of allowing the text to express itself through interpretation by projecting oneself into the "world" of the text and discovering its inner logic, the preacher actually superimposed a modern situation onto the text. So the text does not make the point intended by the ancient author but it says what the lazy, careless or ignorant minister wants it to say.

Now the minister doesn't have to begin with a text. It is valid to begin with a modern situation and read through texts until one is found that addresses the modern problem. However, one must make certain that the text says what one thinks it says! We all have heard sermons preached by experienced and trained pastors who used texts that scored a point in antiquity *exactly opposite* to that point being scored by the pastor in the modern situation. This abuse of the text will only happen if the pastor does not (or cannot) do the necessary homework properly.

One fails as a minister of the written word if one neglects a serious in-depth study of the text. If one doesn't know what the text meant, how can one tell people what it means? One should not confuse "what the text meant" with "what it means" for these statements are not necessarily the same thing.[1] What the text *meant* in an ancient situation may not be the

[1] As examples of approaching the text in terms of "what it meant" and "what it means" compare the treatment of the parable of the unforgiving servant (Matt. 18:21-35) by the following two authors: Eta Linnemann, *Jesus of the Parables* (New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1966), pp. 105-113 and Dan Otto Via, Jr. *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 137-144.

same thing it *means* in a modern situation, when it addresses contemporary audiences. If one assumes that what it meant in an ancient situation is what it means in a modern situation, one risks "archaizing" oneself and one's people; that is, one projects ancient time-bound life styles and ethical systems onto the modern situation. For example, "archaizing" I Cor. 11:5 allows some pastors to require that women not cut their hair for it is dishonoring. (More controversial situations could easily be cited.) Such literalism is an escape into legalism rather than responsible interpretation. Rather than projecting the ancient requirement whole-cloth onto the modern situation, interpreting the text requires that one determine the essential point the author was trying to make by the statement in the ancient situation and look for modern equivalents that will score the same point in a contemporary situation. These equivalents may not be stated the same way, but they mean the same thing! Such an exercise requires a detailed study of the text from a historical perspective, and an understanding of the dynamics of the modern situation. Both of these enterprises require a great deal of time and effort. Neither should be treated "off the cuff."

III. Concern for People Lessens the Intensity of the "Religious" Vision

Quality preaching is characterized by a sensitivity to and concern for the needs of people. Since the ministry by definition is a helping occupation and deals in a service, most—if not all—pastors are concerned about the welfare of people. However, ministers are also under the pressure of an intense religious experience and often there is a subtle clash between the two concerns. If the intensity of the pastor's religious vision overshadows a concern for people, it can lead to an abuse of people. Under the influence of an intense religious commitment many pastors can confuse their position and role in the church. Some see themselves as infantry platoon leaders standing in front of the church shouting "follow me men; let's take that hill," or they visualize themselves as disciplinarians who stand behind the church coercing it and driving it in what they conceive to be the "right" direction. Actually the pastor's position is neither out front leading nor in the rear driving, rather it is in the midst of the congregation being moved by and responding to the pain and perplexity of the people.

The gospel is after all "good news" *(euangelion)* for human beings enmeshed in tragic human situations. They may hold their humanity in common but their tragedies are intensely personal. In order to communicate the "good news" the pastor must be aware of people as individuals and see their personal tragedies from the perspective of their suffering. The key to ministry is to perceive the individual and the individual's need! The "leader" will try to inspire confidence in a vision of great success and to call for commitment to the goals of the vision—that may or may not be shared by the members of his congregation. The "driver" demands unquestioning obedience to the vision and cites divine prerogative as authority, *i.e.* "this is after all the will of God." Those who

dissent are dismissed as being "outside the will of God." One should beware of those who know with certainty God's will for the lives of others. Their counsel will lead to bondage and the loss of Christian freedom. On the other hand, the true minister is there to be "used" by the people, the goal of the true minister is neither great success nor "overcoming the world" but simply caring for and serving the people.

The church does not exist for the pastor to drive, cajole, lead, shear, or reprimand, rather it is there to be served. The pastor is not its leader but its servant. The people are not the pastor's personal means to accomplish the will of God, rather the pastor is God's means to promote the well-being of the people.

The care of the people is more important than the vision! One who has this attitude will never confuse one's own sermons as the word and the will of God. Rather one will recognize and make allowance for an understandable human inability to discern with clarity the contemporary manifestation of God's will. The pastor is *not* "God's spokesman" whose words carry special divine authority, rather the pastor is a "spokesman *for* God" whose words must stand or fall on the basis of their own inherent value. Therefore what the pastor says is subject to scrutiny, challenge, and *rejection* by the congregation. The pastor does not speak "God's word"; rather the pastor speaks a "word in God's behalf." Some preachers assume too much authority in the pulpit and generally overstep the borders both of their knowledge and skill. It is unfortunately true, in such cases, that the force of a preacher's dogmatism seems to exist in direct proportion to a lack of scholarship and insensitivity to human need. The more authoritarian a preacher is, the less sensitivity that preacher evidences to individual human tragedy and suffering; and the more sensitive a preacher is to the hurt of the people, the less dogmatic that preacher is.

Quality preaching is occasioned by human need and is motivated by a desire to meet that need. It does not appear that quality preaching can be occasioned by an intense religious vision nor can it be motivated by a desire to force single-handedly the coming of the kingdom of God. For visionaries are comsumed by their vision that must be realized "come hell or high water," and under such intense pressure one tends to lose sight of the individual. In short, visionaries are "big picture people." Quality preaching, on the other hand, is the strength of the person sensitive enough to be deeply touched by the suffering of individuals. Such a person frankly is uninfluenced by the demands of the "big picture" because of a primary concern with its individual parts. Each tree in the wood is so distinctive that one does not look for the parameters of the forest. It is this "weakness" that is in reality strength in the pulpit. Preaching so motivated will never be irrelevant nor lacking in power, nor devoid of scholarship.

Some pastors have not neglected the art of quality preaching and when one hears such a speaker, one knows that this pastor's homework has been carefully done. But sadly one does not find pastors who practice the art of quality preaching behind every pulpit. In my own denomination such

pastors appear to be the exception rather than the rule. This is something of a sad commentary for a people who "pride" themselves on being "a people of the book."

This situation can be improved, but it will require a concerned response on the part of those in a position to have an influence on the ecclesiastical *status quo*. By this I mean to infer national and state denominational workers, and college and seminary faculties. By changing the instructional stress in academic institutions the quality of preaching could be profoundly influenced in just a few short years. Currently homiletics—the art of developing and preaching sermons—is the approach generally taken to preaching instruction by academic faculties. Homiletics stresses sermon form, style of public speaking, types of sermons, voice control, etc. In short, it is a "how to" workshop on the art of public speaking as found in the ecclesiastical setting. However, what the pastor needs is instruction in hermeneutic—the art of interpretation.[2] A hermeneutical approach to preaching would incorporate homiletics, but the primary stress in instruction would be upon biblical interpretation. Instructors in such departments would not hold a degree in public speaking as their primary skill area with some adjunct training in biblical studies. Rather instructors would be trained primarily in biblical interpretation and ethics with adjunct ability and skill in the art of public speaking. This is because the stress in hermeneutic is upon *what* is said more than upon *how* it is said. Indeed, the *how* follows from the *what*. The product of this shift in emphasis will be a preacher who is keenly aware that the preacher's *primary* responsibility is to be an interpreter of the written word! Finesse in public speaking is a secondary consideration. What I'm saying is: if the preacher has something to say that is solid in content it can be said in a less polished way, because what is said will make a profound impact in spite of the preacher's limitations as a public speaker. But it is a farce to preach shallow sermons, even when they are spoken with great skill!

National and state denominational workers can develop resources for workshops in hermeneutic. Such workshops will require priority in planning and money because it will not be possible in any other way to pull together workshop faculties comprised of men and women who have the requisite training, skill and stature. The focus of such workshops is not *how* to preach sermons—this we stress already at the college and seminary levels. The goal of the workshop is to teach preachers how to become hermeneutes! And there is a great deal of difference between the two. If the workshops are to be a success they will require the support of the people and the conviction of the pastors that such workshops will improve their "ministry of the word." The latter requirement may be more difficult to

---

[2]For detailed discussions of hermeneutic see the collection of essays in James M. Robinson and John B. Cobb, Jr., eds. *The New Hermeneutic* (New Frontiers in Theology vol. 2: New York, Evanston and London: Harper and Row, 1964); for a brief introduction to the subject see Paul J. Achtemeier, *An Introduction to the New Hermeneutic* (Philadelphia: Wesminster Press, 1969). For popular application of the new hermeneutic to a preaching context see Richard C. White, "Preaching the New Hermeneutic, "*Lexington Theological Quarterly* 9 (July, 1974) 61-71.

realize as the workshops will necessitate on the preacher's part re-learning and new learning. In short, it will involve change and change has theological implications. And of course there is always the problem of ego . . . ! However, the support of the people is the more critical. If the people sense a problem in this area, something *will*—eventually—be done about it! And if the people do not sense a problem? Well, it would appear that many pulpits will continue to feature mediocre sermons preached by shallow, scholarless but well meaning men and women until the people do make such demands and provide for excellence in preaching.

"Just Church Bells?" — Preaching Today: One Man's View

Dr. Charles Rice

A student of mine, seminarian and fledgling preacher, came in recently to talk about his vocation. "My big problem is how to get enough illustrations to make my sermons alive." He seemed confident enough about his ability to do exegesis, write, and speak, but when it came to what he called "real experiences," he was at a loss. In the course of our conversation, I did suggest that his problem might diminish when he was living in a community among the people to whom he preached, not to mention just a bit longer— the recent history and leading issues of homiletics emerged.

What makes for lively preaching? What is the place of the Bible and how are those witnesses related to our efforts to give voice to the gospel? What precisely is the communication of the gospel; does it have a specific form, is anything precluded, required? One does not have to be just out of seminary to feel those concerns deeply. Many veterans of the pulpit are asking such questions week after week. What is preaching, and how is it done when it is done well?

Some among us—fewer than five years ago—take a dim view of the whole business. One seminary professor with whom I talked recently described preaching as "just church bells." People welcome the familiar sound of the preacher, and all the more as our environment becomes less and less familiar and predictable. Deeply ingrained stereotypes and rigid expectations surround the pulpit, to the degree that people can become as disturbed by departures in style—tone, manner, the length and vocabulary of the sermon—as by content which is heterodox. The preacher, in what he or she says, and in the *way* in which it is said, is closely identified in the

Charles Rice, a minister of the United Church of Christ, is associate professor of homiletics in the Theological School of Drew University, Madison, N.J. Dr. Rice is the author, most recently, of *Easter, B,* with Louis Martyn, in *Proclamation: Aids for Interpreting the Lessons of the Church Year,* published by Fortress Press, and he is the editor of *Word and Witness,* the liturgical and homiletical resource for preaching the church year which is published by Sunday Publications, Palm Springs, Florida.

minds of many churchgoers with the way it was or the way it *ought* to be. In this role, the preacher becomes, too often, the moral arbiter for the relative values of a given community, the scrupulous social puppet, or, on the other hand, the alter ego who is *expected* to disquiet the community within a controlled situation. If we picture a person who has long since stopped going to church, lying in bed on Sunday morning listening with mixed nostalgia, guilt, and pleasure to the church bells ringing, we might come close to a description of the actual function of preaching for a good many people today.

Issue-Oriented Approach

We have, of course, tried various ways of making preaching "relevant." Perhaps we need only ring the bells louder or play a more up-to-date tune. In the Sixties the pulpit became, in many quarters, a forum for the social issues of the day. No one would wish to suggest that preachers consciously seized on timely social issues *just* to make preaching relevant. But whatever the motivation, conscious or unconscious, preachers following quite rightly in the tradition of Rauschenbusch, Niebuhr, and Fosdick were attuned to the times. A sermon was not a sermon which did not end with some reference to the cover story of one of the weekly newsmagazines. And many of us preaching in the Sixties were not nearly so assiduous as Niebuhr in appropriating the Biblical tradition to the issues of the day, nor so sage as Fosdick in discerning the deeper spiritual needs of men and women which lay behind the news stories. And has anyone in this century held together as well as Walter Rauschenbusch an outgoing and active concern for the city and the nation with a pastor's intentional nurturing of his own flock? Though it is a generalization to say so, as we look back we can see that in the interest of relevance many a preacher lost his feet.

Pulpit Intellectualism

Closely tied to the issue-oriented sermon is the intellectualism of the pulpit. That may come as a surprise to some who would like to hear *more* fresh ideas from the pulpit. Who wouldn't! But on all fronts preaching in the United States has tended toward intellectualism. Ministers, for one thing, are trained in academic institutions; some of the leading seminaries are entities of universities. What is more, intellectual attainment still carries status in this country. In fact, mere association with an academic institution, quite apart from one's actual achievement, carries status: it is the college *degree,* not a college education, which counts for many. Small wonder that preachers are prone to intellectualism in the pulpit, what better place can one imagine for academic pretension?

This intellectualism takes many forms. The language of the seminary classroom and of theological lecture hall is all too apparent in the pulpit. The Bible, an earthy and colorful book about vivid human beings,

becomes a kind of textbook or a collection of briefs to be *used* by the preacher in making a didactic sermon. Or, in other circles, the Bible is a collection of proof-tests which are severed from their literary context and from all vital connection with the people of the Bible and used in a wooden and formal way much as one would give footnotes to a term paper.

Both what we have loosely called "liberal" and "fundamentalist" preaching have all the marks of intellectualist impersonalism and pretension. Both make for homiletical docetism: The Word does not become flesh. And, as Robert Raines says, the word is just so much wind until you put your life, real human life, life lived at a given time and place, up for a sail.

Institutional Influence

While we are on what must by now seem quite a negative note, there is one other thing to be said about where we have been—in preparation for describing where we are and where we might be headed. The influence of the institutional and increasingly bureaucratic church on the pulpit is just beginning to be clearly seen. We used to lament the moralism of the pulpit: in any given town on a Sunday morning, you could bet that the preacher would spend seventy percent of the time telling people what they had done that was bad and what they had not done that was required. Today we are as much aware of promotionalism as of moralism. How many sermons have behind them the hidden agendas of organizational aggrandizement, upward mobility, and downright manipulation?

Is Wesley Seeliger right that we are more and more caught by "settler theology" in which God becomes the mayor, the minister the bank teller, and Jesus the sheriff? (*Cf.* Wesley Seeliger, *Western Theology,* Atlanta: Forum House, 1973.) Seeliger proposes, by contrast, a "pioneer theology" in which the minister—"Hot Sauce Smith"—is camp cook, Jesus the scout, and the bishops the dishwashers! And the point of it all is to be out on the trail and on the move with the people! What difference do those two images make for preaching? How much of our preaching should be given to building up the institution and to assuring our success in it?

I recently heard an exegesis of the parable of the mustard seed—by the way, this was in a *communal* exegesis—which helped us to see that the seed has to be trusted and hoped-in rather than fretted over or even used up. For example, those birds that come to rest in the spreading branches of the mature mustard; if they had seen that little seed lying around, they probably would have *eaten* it! How can we know when we are eating the seed of our own future? What does, finally, build up the church, since it is not just another organization but is the people of God who live and die by the *gospel?*

The Renewal in Preaching

But all of this is background to what is happening in the American pulpit

today. The number of students taking homiletics in the seminaries is up, the major churches—particularly the Roman Catholic Church—are giving more attention to preaching, and whatever we may think of the style and content of their preaching, the television preachers are more popular than ever. The college chaplains I know report renewed interest in preaching and just this Lent—if one man's experience counts for anything—I have seen more people at special preaching services than in some time. To speak of a renaissance or a revival would be premature, but we might take heart to respond to what appears to be an increasingly felt need among the people. What signs are there, quite apart from hunches and statistics, of the renewal of preaching from within?

We are seeing the desacralizing and humanizing of preaching. Massive, distant pulpits are, in some places and albeit slowly, giving way to smaller, even mobile, furniture. New church architecture is likely to be more flexible, earthy, on a human scale, with the people, including the preacher, gathered around the altar-table. The ancient practice of preaching from the table is being revived in some places, and even where that is not the case there is an effort to "place" the sermon in the context of the common meal. We may be realizing today in practice what Karl Barth urged in his *Church Dogmatics,* that word and sacrament be held together on every occasion of the church's worship. That, he thought, was where the word could be heard as proclamation, where we are kept conscious of our humanity, of our dependence upon bread and wine for the presence of Christ among us, just as in the plain humanity of our words we may hear the word. Architectural taste among Christians is beginning to reflect Barth's insight into the humanity of preaching.

Preaching In, Sermons Out

And the style of preaching reveals more and more this truth, that the Word becomes *flesh* when we preach, and that the word is not well served by any form or flourish or pretension which obscures our common humanity. Sermons are becoming less formal, more open to the moment, more spontaneous. John Killinger has said that "preaching is in, sermons are out." That is to say, as I understand him, that we are interested not much in the polished, formal, finished piece as in the real event which is made possible when a person has carefully and prayerfully prepared something to say, and himself or herself to say it, and then has joined us in worship with the willingness to be really present at prayer and celebration with us even *while* preaching among us. Even the homemade stoles which our preachers are wearing—rather than the slick and elegant ones of the past—tell us that something is changing in preaching that is making it more of the earth and earthy.

Two good books on the subject of church architecture for today's church are Thor Hall, *The Future Shape of Preaching* (Fortress, 1971) and E. A. Sovik, *Architecture for Worship* (Augsburn, 1973). Also James

14

White's *New Forms of Worship* (Abingdon, 1971) and *Christian Worship in Transition* (Abingdon, 1976) are very useful. Fred Craddock (As One Without Authority, Phillips Univ., 1974) and Clement Welsh *(Preaching in a New Key,* Pilgrim, 1974) propose an inductive approach which, in the form and content of the sermon, begins with and stays close to the experience of the immediate community.

Storytelling

Fresh understanding of preaching as an art opens the way to new forms for treasured content. Preachers are becoming storytellers again, and that must be one of the most significant developments in homiletics in some time, for two reasons. First, the openness and ability to hear a story, to really enter in and follow a story, is essential to understanding the Bible. We have to *enter* the scriptures before we can hope to lead anyone else into a meeting with the tradition. And, on the other hand, our access and understanding of our own experience is by way of seeing our life itself as narrative. We need to learn to hear and tell our own stories—not just our individual experience, but the stories we share with a given community and humankind—as much as we need to enter in and follow the Bible's unfolding story of God's ways with us.

Both the preparation and sharing of sermons, particularly if they come from communal exegesis (whether with our fellow clergy or with our people) provides us an opportunity to enter and share stories in a meaningful and life-giving way. The works of Sam Keen *(Telling Your Story,* with Anne Valley Fox, Doubleday, 1973) and Sallie Te Selle *(Speaking in Parables,* Fortress, 1975) are helpful. Amos Wilder's little book *(Theopoetic,* Fortress, 1976) provides both a theological and aesthetic context for preaching as an art form.

Biblical Preaching

I am hearing much more biblical preaching than five years ago. But it is biblical preaching with a plus. That is, we no longer assume that a sermon is biblical just because it is salted and peppered with Bible verses, or because it "takes a text." And the proof-texting sermon is less and less satisfying to people who validate words by their congruence with real experience. The biblical preaching which seems now to be a possibility takes the Bible seriously, not in the sense of fixing on bits and pieces, or spinning out long sermons on a mere snippet of scripture, but in the sense of seeing that the Bible is about real people, written by real men and women to persons trying to live on the earth together.

Once the Bible is apprehended in that way—I sometimes think that what we need is to have the Bible really speak to us just once—then preaching is transformed. All the gimmicks and superficial attempts at relevance come off badly in the face of a biblical image, a parable of Jesus, a compelling narrative, which meets us where we live to judge and redeem us.

15

In my own classes in homiletics the two experiences which I am trying to give every student are: 1) exegetical study together toward preaching, and 2) telling and hearing stories. And I attempt to do that in all my classes, whether in "preaching arts" or "preaching and communication theory." Whatever else we do to sharpen our skills and broaden our horizons, it is finally a direct personal encounter with the biblical tradition and with each other which nourishes, challenges, and enables our preaching. People are ready to hear the Bible, as it addresses their real experience, and it just may be that the seminaries and ministers in their parishes are able now, after a good many excursions here and there, to hear the Bible in a new way and to preach from it with integrity.

Role of Congregation

The congregation is beginning to learn, and to assume, its role in preaching. Dietrich Ritschl proposed years ago (A Theology of Proclamation, Know, 1960) that the congregation be invited into the preparation of sermons. He suggested that the pastor meet with a group of people each week, in a revival of the old conventicle, to do exegesis for the coming Sunday's sermon. We are beginning to see that kind of participation by those who listen to sermons.

An Oral Art Form

We are more and more willing to let the sermon be an art form. It should have been apparent to us all along that the sermon is not an essay, not essentially a literary piece at all. It is, rather, an *oral* art form. Writing is part of the preparation for the sermon's presentation, to be sure, but it is entirely possible to have a written sermon and not have preaching. A recent book proposes a method of preparation which is more in keeping with preaching's peculiar form as a *speech event.* (Clyde Fant, *Preaching for Today,* Harper, 1975). An older book describes preaching as a "folk art," Bruce Rosenberg, *The Art of the American Folk Preacher* (Oxford, 1970).

Talented Listening

Congregations are learning also what is involved in listening. Chester Pennington has written a good book which treats, among other things, the art of "talented listening." (God Has a Communication Problem, Hawthorn, 1975). But the most promising movement may be the involvement of laypersons in communal exegesis toward the sermon.

Following the paradigm for biblical study which Walter Wink has developed (The Bible in Human Transformation: A New Paradign for Biblical Study, Fortress, 1973) groups of people meet with the preacher to study the pericope from which he or she will preach. These sessions are informal, and the object is to create what Wink calls a "communion of horizons" within which the biblical message can be heard. The group seeks

to *discover* the meaning of the text, to raise their existential questions around the text, and to let themselves be addressed. Such sessions can actually provide the preacher with the images needed to lead the larger congregation into an encounter with the text in the Sunday sermon.

More Prophetic Preaching

Much remains to be said about the state of preaching today. We are seeing more and more women in the pulpit, and a good many teachers of homiletics are agreed that some of the best in the pulpit now are women, perhaps because of their freedom from the stereotypes which inhibit the male from free expression in the pulpit. Women, too, represent in an unmistakeable way the irony of preaching: "We have this treasure in earthen vessels . . . ." This is *not* where we expect to hear the Word. Also, the preacher is less and less content to participate naively in civil religion. At least, if I am to preach on the Fourth of July or at baccalaureate, I am likely to be more aware that this is not a specifically Christian occasion.

And even when the agenda of evangelism is concerned, the preacher is likely to be more discerning these days: we preach because we have something to celebrate, *not* merely to get more church members. There is, too, a widening gap between the parish minister and the "stars" of television, and some hard thinking needs to be done at that point, unless Martin Marty is right that preaching as showmanship is a passing fad. But these are beyond the range of this essay.

What we can say is that we can expect more down-to-earth, biblical, creative, and probably more prophetic preaching. By "prophetic" I mean simply preaching which knows where people are and meets them there, as H. H. Farmer would put it with the "ultimate demand and final succour" of the gospel.

Chaplains as Prophets—Innocents, Martyrs and Moralizers*

Chaplain (COL) Mark M. McCullough, Jr.

I hear a recurring insistence within the Army Chaplaincy that we have a prophetic ministry to the system, or if there is doubt that we can make such a claim, the issue is addressed as a question. "How can we as clergy exercise a prophetic ministry to the Army?" My theses in this paper are that we *do not* have a prophetic ministry within the Army, and that a concept of ministry is *misplaced* in the American Army. I believe that the demand for it or claim to it reflects our inability to accept our central problems of giving moral legitimacy to a power to which we are at the same time very much peripheral. To discuss prophetic ministry in the Army requires that I range beyond the Army to look quickly at the autonomy of secular systems, the characteristics of both American government and religion, and some possible motivations of the prophet himself.

The Problem of Autonomy and our Responses to It

Let me begin with the problem. The central problem is that we as chaplains help to legitimate the exercise of power by a system that is not only secular, not only naturalistic, but constantly operates from an assumed moral autonomy. This is a big and post-Constantine problem, and it is only more sharply focused for chaplains than for others. Because of that autonomy, we usually must find that what we think of as prophetic speaking to this system is futile in results. We tend to speak in moral absolutes. And in confronting a morally autonomous system with moral absolutes, we speak a language to which the system will not respond, particularly in the United

Chaplain McCullough, an Episcopal Chaplain, is Assistant Commandant of the US Army Chaplain Center and School. He came to the School in 1974 from graduate work in political science with the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, New School for Social Research. Earlier assignments included duty as Film Officer, US Army Chaplain Board, and duty with troop units.

States. Moral judgment is rarely a part of political or military decision-making, and the presence among decision-makers of "committed Christians" is irrelevant. From the power structure's perspective, we chaplains (and all clergy) are peripheral to power.

By claiming the right to confront the system and then labelling this confrontation "prophetic," we not only continue to be ineffectual in "witnessing," but more unfortunate than that, we deceive ourselves. Lacking competence in politics or systems, we resort to moral pronouncements. Impatient and often ignorant of "what is," we hastily occupy the high ground of "what ought to be." Church conferences are similarly enamoured of their own resolutions to Congressmen or local legislators, a 'witness' that is moved by the same impulse as our urge to "proclaim God's judgment" to the establishment. Most such witness is preambled by a ringing proclamation to some effect that "whereas Jesus Christ (or "God" if Christology is at issue) is the Lord of all creation, and whereas He calls us to account as good stewards," and so on, and on, and on. The resolution that follows is interchangeable among such issues as capital punishment, world hunger, Vietnam, DDT, housing, racial justice, prostitution, or casino gambling. It is, of couse, useless because it cites an authority that does not bind either Congress or the state, one that is practically empty of meaning to politicians. But worse, having passed the resolution, we are left with clear consciences to do nothing whatever. I stress the first person throughout: I am even more susceptible to such self-deception and rhetorical religion than most.

Separation of Church and State and the Secular Covenant

Why does "thus saith the Lord" or "whereas God is ruler of all creation" fall on indifferent ears in our American system, both military and political? Historically, these ciatations of divine authority commended themselves only within a covenant of God and the state. The Jewish prophets spoke to a state that was also a church, and there was at least a consensus of acquiescence in divine authority within the political community.[1] Vestiges of that remain even to the present where there is an establishment of religion. In Great Britain, for example, there is at least the symbolic presence of religion to the political process. There have been occasions in modern history when the objections of the Archbishops did affect Parliamentary decisions. While it is most remote from the Jewish covenant, it is still the kind of symbol that can mean an acceptance of the appropriateness of the church's speaking to the system and of her being at moments a little less distant from the political center.

Our conventional wisdom is that our idol of "separation of church and state" is practically an unmixed blessing and that there is little good to be said of an establishment of religion. We fail to note the hostility toward

---

[1]"Church" and "state" are our categories to describe an ancient reality for which these categories are inappropriate, I realize. But it's the quickest way to make the point.

religion that is available in our present American model of religion-governmental relationships. The model was conceived by its most influential originators as religious autonomies run rampant in adversary relationships with each other, a conflict that would act as "checks and balances" in the religious sector. Madison favored such a proliferation of warring churches and sects as would guarantee the political powerlessness of any one group or coalition of religions. We were founded as a secular state, and if the Founders intended the Establishment Clause not to mean the modern "separation" but rather a benevolent even-handedness which would allow cooperation of church and state, it was not with any pious faith in the church as a national conscience or prophetic voice.[2] These institutional roles of conscience and prophecy are non-political and therefore marginal to politics. It was rather that in a new nation needing efficacy and stability, the church's cooperation as moral authority in undergirding the new political authority was welcomed. Some, like Hamilton and Washington, felt that religion as a pillar of virtue was essential to the stability and even survival of the republic. Thus, even in separating church and state, we as American Christendom have not budged the ancient fact of having the political authority define and delimit our effect upon its secular autonomy. Since Constantine, religion has benefitted the state far more than it has been helped by the establishment: religion has given to political power the moral validity it required to be authoritative. This is a very large generalization, and the specifics of it are part of our chaplain problem.

We should, therefore, be clear in our understanding that there is no covenant of government with God or with any divine principle. There is thus no responsibility within the state to be true to a nonexistent covenant. But the Constitution, as higher law binding both people and state, is a covenant, setting limits on the power both of the people and their government. It is thus a secular covenant between the people and the state that is also the final arbiter of important public disputes. It is, as we shall see, the charter from which all bureaucratic systems derive their purposes and authority. This fact is important if we ever attempt to call any bureaucracy in our federal system to account for its acts.

The Validity of the Non-prophetic Challenge

Most claims to a prophetic presence seem to be directed toward "the system," the command, the establishment. One occasionally hears the statement that the "Chief of Chaplains should be our prophetic voice to the

---

[2]The churches as they were known to the Framers had hardly sought a prophetic voice in the councils of state. Their involvement in state politics had been, by and large, a grab for power and would advance their own class and denominational interests at the expense of other religious groups. Not only Anglicans and Congregationalists played the power game, but Presbyterians and Baptists as well. They thus taught any doubting Founders that religious institutions are no more to be trusted with political power than any other pressure group.

rest of the Army." The expectation is unreal: it is a role which he not only *cannot* fill but *should not*. His role is part of a rationalized bureaucracy (in the non-pejorative sense of the word to which I'll return), and the prophetic is as much a non-category to that context as the moral absolute is a non-category to the political process. Administration cannot be prophetic. But he also, as representative of the chaplaincy, has a non-prophetic but unique role in challenging other elements within the system when their assumption of moral autonomy issues in policies that infringe the conscience or the dignity of the military member. This duty has been done by Chiefs, but it is not prophecy. In fact, if it were phrased as prophecy it would fail. It stands a chance of success when it is a challenge to erroneous assumptions of autonomy and the nonaccountability that follows. This arrogance of the system is a constant threat, because not only is government threatened by autonomies out of control, but society also is being dangerously fragmented. In this context, the current celebration of our ethnic pluralism is creating a deplorable pantheon of new and self-serving little idols within the society. The "single cause" constituencies, be they labor, commerical, ethnic, abortionist, environmentalist, or what have you, are a growing menace to a political process that must try to make coherent policies while placating aggressive "causes" stalking the elected official.

Personal Needs to Prophesy

We have been considering those properties of our American system that would make a prophetic ministry within the system an ineffectual endeavor. Before turning to the ecclesiastical foundations of our ministry in the Army, I would raise some questions about personal motivations to be a prophet. Even though what follows is couched in declarative sentences, my intent is more tenuous, more inclined to ask questions. My statement-questions are appropriate to behavioral studies, and I have no credentials in that field.

There seem to be undertones of psychopathology in some of our insistence on a prophetic ministry to the system. One senses an underlying current of hostility to adult authority in some claims to witness. The system is authority, parental by analogy, and perhaps the present-day Jeremiah has not yet resolved his struggle to deal with authority as an adult. Righteous indignation is thus one of the greatest of all deceivers of self.

Another undertone is the psychic need some seem to have to suffer injustice at the hands of powerful sinners. The urge to be a martyr is well served by proclaiming one's self a prophet, antagonizing those who can retaliate, and then rejoicing in one's own faithfulness in the face of the inevitable "persecution for one's principles." The martyr is blessed with a mind which sees "compromise" or "adaptation" as apostasy, with a *modus operandi* that lays on the system the demands of a moral or spiritual absolute. Only surrender to this moral imperative is acceptable to the prophet, but political and bureaucratic systems cannot surrender to

22

absolutes without also destroying human freedom. The stage is beautifully set for the inexorable playing out of the martyrdom. The church's instincts for centuries have been healthy about this kind of suffering: you are not a martyr if you actively court your own martyrdom. To do so is a horrendous presumption upon God in his purposes, and the wrath of man that takes the course of life out of the hands of God.

The question about the constellation of courage, power, and masculinity needs to be raised, in the exercise of moral courage required to confront a masculine and powerful autonomy. Moral courage is a rare and magnificent virtue in the service of a considered and important principle. In the service of anything much less, it becomes rashness, and the source of imprudent rashness is not in thought but in the viscera, a poor guide for important judgments. What visceral needs does it then serve? Do we, sensing our impotence outside the power centers, try for power by proclaiming fearlessly our judgment? Our motives always need careful scrutiny, which does not mean that mixed-up motives should be an excuse for inaction.

In the 1960's and early 70's, public discourse was reduced to verbal thrashing because of the demands of moral purists on all sides that everyone take sides on whatever issue caught their "consciences." Clergy and seminarians are particularly vulnerable to this demand, because we are under a compulsion to see most public (and too many private) issues through a moral prism. Thus, while wisdom might counsel us to take no sides in a particular controversy, if we see it as a moral question, we are compelled to "stand up and be counted."

The Inadequacy of American Christendom

In American Christendom we have, within our religion itself, no base for a prophetic ministry. Not only do we face a secular system that assumes its own moral sovereignty, but we come from churches that have long idolized the national good and identified it with their own religion, that have made Christ so pervasive a cultural phenomenon that the tension of church and state is rarely felt. In fact, except for abortion and private school aid, the tension is rarely evident between state and church, *i.e.,* between sin and salvation. This is our mainline American religion, and exceptions are no more helpful. Some smaller Christian bodies, heeding the call to separate from the world, have become ghettoes of the spirit, constantly reinforcing their own faith by comdemning the satanic humanism that threatens to engulf the faithful remnant. They represent Christ against the culture, and their influence is negligible. Larger in scope but still self-limiting in American culture is the current growth of religious-political conservatism. There is even less tension within this currently growing conservatism than within the mainstream of American religion. It seeks to "make America Christian" by individual conversions, particularly of the influential, but this conversion is a purely personal experience that has no social or

political dimension. There is nothing of Jonathan Edwards' vision of the "beautiful society" in this present evangelism.

Thus, most of us chaplains come out of a Christendom that has said "yes" to the world with such readiness that even if it could get the attention of the powers that be, Christendom would have nothing particularly prophetic to say to them, but much that is secular. (Most Christian spokesmen against the war in Vietnam spoke in secular terms, on the faulty assumption that they had to be accepted on the secular terms of the youthful purists whom religion must not "turn off.") American white Christendom, optimistic about man and his potential, believing yet in human progress, blending its values with the national values, spiritually myopic to the dark and tragic vision of man, is too frail a structure to uphold its chaplains in their prophetic stance vis-a-vis the society and the political authority as encountered in the military system.

The history of Christendom since the prophets of the Reformation offers no more encouragement to its prophetic spokesmen than does our American religion. Prophets have always been in short supply and in even shorter demand, and because they threaten to disrupt the pastoral care to which their churches are committed, they are hardly seen as a blessing by the church. *In fact, it is Christendom itself that is historically the prophet's antagonist.* The problem is further compounded by the fact that in confronting the state, be it our liberal democracy, fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, Marxist Cuba or Russia, Christianity has for its biblical resources only a few scattered New Testament fragments which are little help in forming a doctrine of the state, the vocation of political authority and of the citizen, a doctrine that is convincing as Christian and biblical. As Americans, our problem is not made easier by the nature of the national idols that would be the prophet's targets: they enshrine many humane values that are a far cry from the Nazi or Khmer Rouge beast. Also from our British roots we have a pragmatic, materialistic democratic process that is free of ideology. Ideology, particularly in the French and most subsequent revolutions, is a highly visible idol, because it is the moral absolute, injected into the political process. It is alien to our way of governing and rationalizing our governing. Its absence also means that some potent idols are well camouflaged within the society itself, *e.g.,* egalitarianism, self-fulfillment, and so forth.

What Can We Do?

The Army is not autonomous. No army can be allowed to be its own sovereign if a civil government exists and is to survive. It does not define the national enemy, the aims of war, or the limits of its operations. It does not make policy, it does not raise money to fight, it does not levy conscription to fill its ranks. It does not select its leadership. It does not have arbitrary power over its newest private. It cannot prescribe what its members will believe in politics, religion, or in any other area, although the application of

behavioral science to training and indoctrination should not make us too sanguine about the inviolability of the soldier's 'inner space.'

All this is to stress the fact that both in concept and practice the Army derives its internal power and its mission from the political authority, *i.e.,* the Congress and the President. The charter for the Army, as for all bureaus of the executive branch, is the Federal Constitution. The whole vast federal bureaucracy is constitutionally chartered, *i.e.,* its purposes, the scope of its authority, its powers to make laws and regulations are all derived from acts of Congress that are empowered by the Constitution. The rational basis for the Army's command powers is thus outside of the Army itself. It lies in the acts of the political authority, which should be held accountable for the use or misuse of the Army.

By the same token, war now is always political, always undertaken by the political authority for purposes of national policy, political purposes. If the people regard a war as unnecessary or not in the national interest, their true adversary is not the Army but is their own political center that raises and uses the Army. Yet even here the limits of moral suasion are evident. Had the Supreme Court accepted a challenge of the Constitutionality of the Vietnam War, it probably would have upheld its meeting Constitutional criteria for the legal exercise of war. This would demonstrate that that Branch of the Federal Government that is most crucial to the moral legitimacy of government interprets a constitution and not a moral law. Its interpretation of the constitution is usually politically sensitive and "realistic."

But many individual military members do not understand or accept this derivative nature of their own or the Army's power. French officers after Dienbienphu and many American officers in Vietnam resented what they felt was interference by politicians in their professional competence to "win the war." Unfortunately, our history reinforces this belief in military autonomy with its denial that military leaders are only uniformed employees of their government. As DeToqueville observed, a democracy like the United States, when it goes to war and if it can survive its early defeats, is the most dangerous enemy in the world. It is dangerous because the American's peacetime habits of participation in political processes give him a high stake in national survival. They help assure the ascendancy of first-rate operators to positions of power, and acquiesce pragmatically in the rapid consolidation of power in the executive branch. All these have in the past made it possible for an industrial democracy to wage total war more effectively, without having to consult the "national will" or "general will" so dear to the hearts of European despots. But this also means that vast discretionary powers are willingly vested in the military-civilian executive that is not easily held to account in limited or total war. In times of danger, "civilian control of the military" is more an article of faith than a statement of fact, with some important historical exceptions.

I believe that there are necessary confrontations within the system that can help check the Army's veering toward its autonomy. But first we

must have competency in understanding our democratic system so that we know quite clearly what values we should affirm and which we should resist. *We must affirm the apolitical tradition of the American Army.* We should know the norms of the system and affirm those that are needed to call the system back to its justice. We should discriminate among the loyalties that seek our attention, reminding ourselves, and when necessary, reminding the system, that the object of our loyalty is not any political office or person or any political orthodoxy, but the Constitution. It is those principles and laws that transcend the requirement to obey all orders coming down the chain of command. We should say "no" to the identification of the Army as the last haven of personal values in a value-less country. We should, as chaplains, come to grips with our own ecclesiastical loyalties, because although our most immediate and ap-preicated support is within the Army, our most crucial support is not.

All of this (and you could add much more in values to affirm or resist) says that within the system we can strive at best for proximate justice. With that vocation, we need to invoke our own secular traditions, our Constitutionalism as a way of governing and accepting government, the system's own norms and standards. We should not normally invoke moral absolutes nor take the name of the Lord in vain. Personally, I think we should never defend a war as just. Today, the tiny space between the proponent of a just war and a true war-lover is not even perceptible in actual experience. Christians cannot bless any war, yet we must hold this reservation and detachment in tension with the recognition that the individual soldier should be able to fight a war with a clear, if not a good conscience.

But if the issue of a war is so overwhelming and so driving against the individual conscience that the Christian finds his pastoral ministry in the Army impossible, what should he do? I believe that he can do nothing within the Army system. For one thing, were he to express his outrage, he is, as we have seen, expressing it in the wrong place. In this country, the Army no more makes war than bureaucrats make bureaucracies. The political center, which is ultimately accountable to the electorate, makes the war possible, defines its ends, and deploys its armed forces. It is to that authority that pressure must be applied, and that must be from the Army.

For another thing, to condemn a national policy of war to those who must fight it places the conscientious soldier in a cruel dilemma. Worse it jeopardizes his own safety by distracting his concentration on his survival and that of his friends. *That is a far higher value than the chaplain's need to witness against the policy.*

Am I saying that because we cannot have a prophetic ministry to the system, we have no articulate witness on some of the system's values and deeds? Far from it. The ethic of expediency governs an array of military behaviors whose intentions should be judged by the serious and enduring standards inhering in a Christian image of man. We badly need to gain more critical detachment from our own models of ministry within the

military, and, for Christians, this is an exercise requiring Christian conscience and self-examination, theological intelligence, and much disciplined knowledge of human nature.

Has Christ Not Come in the Christian Witness?

Hearing what I have heard from Christian chaplains on their prophetic ministry, I must add a last word on prophecy. Most models of prophecy used by Christian chaplains are drawn from the Jewish scriptures, our Christian Old Testament. Yet in Christian history, that tradition of prophecy ended with St. John the Baptist. With our Christian faith in Christ as the fulfillment of the Law and the Prophets who by His death and Resurrection altered the relationship between God and the world, are the Old Testament prophets adequate to our ministry now? Unlike ancient Judaism, there is no reality in a Christian covenant to which a prophet speaks: the "New Israel" never became vivid and real in the way the "Old Israel" was, and it is certainly not a political phenomenon as the "old" covenant was. But even without the covenant, prophecy for the church can still call the state back to its vocation, to renunciation of its idols, can expose the demonic in its values. The church is called to resist the aggrandizement of the state in the state's insistence on its moral autonomy that is not accountable to the very sources of its own power and its authority.

A final observation: the true prophet takes some very unpopular things most seriously. He does not take himself seriously. Can we, in this time of unlimited infatuation with the self, and the self's authenticity and its entitlements, get far enough out of selfhood to be captivated by the prophet's transcending reality?

The Ageless Need for a Prophetic Ministry*

Chaplain (MAJ) Carl R. Stephens

"Is there any word from the Lord?" This has been the question of humankind for as long as history has been recorded. At various times and in different cultures this question has been asked of priests, shamen, rabbis, and prophets. The expectation of a response appropriate to the occasion has been as varied as the persons asking the question. In each instance the expectation of the inquirer has been profoundly influenced by his/her culture.

During those periods in human history, when traditions were being abandoned and accepted standards were being ignored or radically changed by mass behavior, it seems the prophet has risen to the occasion and dared to say to institutions, and even to nations, "Thus saith the Lord."

We live in such a period. Because we do, we also need the ministry of true prophets. Prophets who call us to where life and its mysteries are engaged for their own sake and enjoyed for their own sake and where effort is made to share the gift of life more broadly, where there is the Spirit breathing "unutterable groans beseeching God for us."

In the following pages I will define prophecy as I understand it. I will relate the definition to Scripture and to church history. I will suggest standards for measuring a "true prophet." Then I will leave it to the good judgment of the reader to decide whether he/she can be prophetic in his/her own ministry.

Prophecy Defined

Prophecy, from my perspective, is a radical loving response to life. A radical response to life is to be self-critical of one's own situation first of all. It is a call to improve the world in which one lives. It is a critique of the institutions of one's time. A critique of the institutions of one's time comes

---

Chaplain Stephens is a United Methodist clergyman. He is presently a member of the Advanced Class at the US Army Chaplain Center and School. Upon completion of the Career Course he will be assigned to Walter Reed Army Medical Center where he will be involved in the education of physicians. He will be teaching holistic medicine, medical ethics, and communication skills.

---

*See EDITOR'S NOTE at the beginning of the preceding article.

only after a critique of one's own idealogies. This requires reflection and meditation on them. It calls for putting one's ideas to the test, putting them in questions in the light of love and justice. Hocking said, "prophecy is mysticism in action."[1]

Prophecy is more than a simple response to life; it is a confrontation with life's enemies. It encompasses the attitude and action one takes toward evil. It has to do with one's struggle with evil whether one considers the evil implicit in the wrestling of Jacob with the angel; the encounter of Jesus and the devil in the dessert; St. Paul resisting arrest; or Malcolm X attempting to affect racism in white and black America.

Justice is the theme of all prophecy. It has always been the prophet who has announced justice when there was no justice. In most instances the prophetic announcement of justice when there was none had to do with the poor and those who suffer. The poor are those who lack power.

Whatever the situation, the prophetic task is a critical work, a work of judgment, a "testing of the spirits." This implies the necessity of significant and life-changing prayer prior to prophetic utterances.

Prophet Defined

A prophet is one "who is called"; "who proclaims the Word of Yahweh." He might serve as a hero, except that in the spiritual life there are no heroes.

The common notion that a prophet is one who predicts the future is not accurate. A true prophet does not deal in predictions about the future but in *bringing about the future* and thereby *doing justice* by announcing the coming of justice.

If prophets possess foresight it is because they experience *life* deeply. It is because they are more sensitive to the mysteries of life (good and evil) that all persons share. Psychology has shown us "foresight is primarily insight" and "predictions, however concrete and true to historic situations, are primarily a dramatization of spiritual judgments."[2]

A study of the prophetic literature of the Old Testament shows the announcement of the coming of the Messiah was but a small part of the prophet's message, and what is more, an announcement *is not* a prediction.

Prophecy In The Old Testament

The major characteristic the Old Testament prophets had in common was that they were men of intense prayer. Their prayer life brought them face to face with their vocation which was bearing witness to the demands of the law of Yahweh. Listen to Jeremiah as he faces God in prayer over his vocation:

---

[1]William Hocking, *The Meaning of God In Human Experience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912), p. 439.

[2]C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Fontana Books, 1961), p. 55.

. . . I have appointed you a prophet to the nations. "Ah! Lord God," I answered, "I do not know how to speak; I am only a child." But the Lord God said, "Do not call yourself a child; for you shall go to whatever people I send you and say whatever I tell you to say." (Jeremiah 1:5-7, NEB)

Look at the primary message of the Old Testament prophets as they speak to the issues of their day:

Jeremiah says his calling is to "tear up and to knock down, to build up and to plant." (Jer. 1:10).

Amos suggests the prophet is one who "proclaims" the Word of Yahweh to assure that His people know He is transcendent but near, special to Israel yet God to *all* nations (Amos 1:2).

Hosea declares Him to be a God of Love.

It is Isaiah who promises a new kingship and new life of peace coming through the Messiah.

Israel's great prophets were perceptive and intuitive men who saw far beyond their contemporaries. They were often unpopular because they did not shrink from opposing the easygoing and shortsighted aims of the people. They tried desperately to awaken a sense of responsibility in persons by explaining *each one* had his role in the development and fate of the country. They condemned superficiality and empty ceremony in religion. They reminded their hearers faith depended on the attitude of mind and heart that always preceeds action. They showed religion to be a personal matter. It was through the prophets that the concept of Yahweh as a Universal Being, the God of the whole world arose. A new order is implied in the prophet's message. This new order is heretofore untried; it calls for a love of one's enemy, an embracing of the poor and dispossessed. This produces a "peace the world cannot give." The prophets and their writings thus come to be the basis for Jesus and his Gospel. In many respects the Gospel is a continuation and fulfilling of the activity of the prophets. However, only Jesus managed to break through the particularistic armor and extend the Kingdom of God to embrace the whole world.

The prophets are a paradigm of the influence of organized religion on the government. The prophets from Samuel to Elisha are in chorus in proclaiming that God's existence impinges with radical effect upon political institutions. Samuel, Nathan, Elijah, Micah, and Elisha were intimately concerned with the life of the state. They were crucially involved in the most decisive crises of the nation's history. They frequently came into abrupt, violent conflict with the king. Throughout the period the address of the prophet took its content from the Word and the divine impingement of the Word upon history was made articulate and interpreted by that same word. One must understand, however, that their definition of the Word was possible only as a result of an extended period during which the Word was understood as Covenant. We *cannot* make the same assumption today, but we *cannot* deny the influence of this piece of history upon how we understand and/or do ministry today.

Prophecy In the New Testament

All Christians recognize John the Baptist was the herald of the coming Christ. Most Christians recognize it was his prophetic ministry that cost him his head. Far too few people recognize the prophetic ministry of Jesus and even of the Apostle Paul.

Jesus' life, his teachings, and most of all his being, raised from the dead, are prophetic in the way I have defined prophecy. His method of teaching, in parables, is prophetic because it shattered the piety of the culture of which he was a part. "The parable as a paradigm of reality unfolds the logic of the everyday world in such a way that it is brought to the surface and shattered."[3] Thus Jesus announced his message by way of a shock technique, "for without parables he did not speak to them." (Matt. 13:34-35; Mark 4:33-34)

Jesus places himself in the prophetic tradition of "tearing up and knocking down" in such statements as:

> Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth; it is not peace I have come to bring, but a sword. I have come to set a man against his father, a daughter against her mother, a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. A man's enemies will be those in his own household. (Matt. 10:34-36)

He further warned that his followers would continue the prophetic tradition: "I send you therefore prophets, sages, teachers, some of them you will kill and crucify, others you will flog in your synagogues and hound from your cities." (Matt. 23:34)

> He spoke to them in a parable to show that they should keep on praying and never lose heart: "There was once a judge who cared nothing for God or man, and in the same town there was a widow who constantly came before him demanding justice against her opponent. For a long time he refused; but in the end he said to himself, 'True, I care nothing for God or man; but this widow is so great a nuisance that I will see her righted before she wears me out with her persistence.' " The Lord said, "You hear what the unjust judge says; and will not God vindicate his chosen, who cry out to him day and night, while he listens patiently to them? I tell you, he will vindicate them soon enough. But when the Son of Man comes, will he find faith on earth?" (Luke 18:1-8)

We are told this parable on justice is about the need to pray continually. If we see prayer as the necessary preparation for being a prophet, might such spirituality once again set fire to human history? Might the Word again inflame the conscience of men and women?

Jesus condenses the prophetic ethic when he declares the truth of the law and the prophets depend upon love of God and love of neighbor (Matt 22:35-40). Love, for Jesus, means above all else justice. The only way to love God is by loving one's neighbor; and the only way to love one's neighbor is by justice.

---

[3]Robert W. Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic And The Word of God,* (New York: Harper and Row), p. 194.

Prophecy In History

If a prophet is one "who is called"; "who proclaims" the word of God—that He is transcendent but near, special to Israel yet God of all nations, a God of love, justice, holiness—the number of prophets one could name would be legion. Because this is true it would be futile to try to name more than a few. But I would like to point out some of the evils of life which have been addressed by post-scriptural prophets.

Ivan Illich says: "All authentic movements for change must be concerned with freedom and human liberation. They are an affirmation of life itself against the oppressive forces of exploitation: cultural, ideological, psychological and sexual."[4] Prophets have repeatedly told us any force that inhibits the freedom of another, when that freedom is the actual growth of the individual, is an enemy.

Price Cobbs says, "It is the freedom to understand and alter one's life, both individually and collectively, which has been denied the black man."[5] Thus, we are reminded, racism of *any kind* is a powerful enemy of life.

When persons are taught to believe that their worth as an individual is somehow dependent on being better than others, competition becomes an enemy of life. This leads inevitably to bigness being valued over quality.

Even patriotism can become an enemy of life. Whenever political convenience takes precedence over the importance of human life, patriotism has gone berserk. Traditionally prophets have addressed such issues.

Unfortunately, far too much of the history of Christianity has been a scandal. For example, the church has never fully recovered from Constantine marching individuals to their baptism at spearpoint. The Crusades, the Inquisition, the infamous scapegoating of the Jews which allowed the holocaust, have left scars which time cannot erase. Had there been an active, prophetic ministry during those periods I doubt they would have happened.

Prophecy has played a pathetically small role in the spiritual and theological literature in recent centuries. The basic immobility of life in much of the period could account for it. The primary emphasis of this period was praying to God of affective love. The past three centuries of Christianity have been overly influenced by a Cartesian definition of truth as *neutral* and, therefore, having nothing to do with outrage over injustice.

Under the influence of the industrial revolution, prayer seemed to surrender whatever spirit of prophecy it once possessed. Prayer seemed to turn into itself so that mysticism entered the picture as a special science alongside theology.

---

[4] "The Bread is Rising," a sermon.
[5] Price M. Cobbs & William H. Grier, *Black Rage* (New York: Basic Books, 1968).

The marriage of church and state following the Reformation is another example of the church's failure to offer a prophetic ministry. (This is the patriotism-gone-berserk I mentioned earlier.)

Clericalism, which has reared its ugly head through the centuries, is an example of culture taking precedence over commitment to life. It has insisted on maintaining the status quo. When this happens, the individual's capacity to live life to the full tends to dry up.

What does a prophet have to say to these "enemies of life?" To let them lie is to encourage them; to refuse to say "no" to them is to join them in their rejection of life's mysteries. When a culture, or its institutions, no longer serves life but rather usurps for itself the priority life deserves, then prophets must call that culture and its institutions to account.

Signs of a True Prophet

Throughout history, individuals have tried to develop standards by which a society can evaluate its prophets. This is a difficult task in that a "true prophet is without precedent." However, one can glean some standards which have stood the tests of time. They are:

(1) *A Personal Authenticity.* Man does not live by anger alone, nor does he live solely to strive. One who does is called a fanatic. A true prophet *rejects* a fanatic messianism. The roots of the prophet's message lie deep in his loving response to life. There is a love of life; an appreciation of it that expresses itself first in enjoying life while at the same time being deeply converted by it in its favor.

(2) *Reluctance:* All true prophets manifest a certain reluctance, a shyness to accept the burden of one's prophetic vocation. He accepts the calling reluctantly. He accepts it with the absolute certainty his preaching is addressed to himself as much as to others. His work begins at home.

Moses is a prime example. Isaiah and Jeremiah demonstrated a similar reluctance to leading God's people. I believe this is the reason Jesus was driven so frequently to prayer.

The reluctance stems from a desire to put savoring life ahead of fighting for it and by knowing the price the prophet must usually pay. The true prophet is compelled to share life as he has experienced it. He has a deep longing to improve the opportunities of others to savor life, and to preserve that which is of value in it.

(3) *Creativity:* The prophet issues new life by his radical response to life: he creates. Creativity is related to reluctance because "Creative power is mightier than its possessor." It is authentic creation for the prophet because "disease has never yet fostered creative work."[6] The worshipper does not merely sustain but creates.[7] The prophet's creativity is the attempt

---

[6] Jolande Jacobi, *The Psychology of C. G. Jung,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943), p. 25.
[7] Hocking, *The Meaning of God,* p. 440.

to breathe life again. It is a natural reflection and initiation of the mystery of life in all its fullness. The prophetic response will support and encourage the creative and prophetic whenever it is. The true prophet is not jealous of his/her message.

(4)*Universal:* "Every prophet who denied the Universal should be looked on as a false prophet."[8] The primary reason why a true prophet is universal is that his prayer is a creation of a sense of community that takes place at the level of the unconscious, where all persons share symbols and experiences in common. This is why justice is the primary test of the prophet's authenticity because justice is the necessary ingredient of a universal community.

In the past, "community" meant the world in which one lived. Today community can only mean the worldwide community. This lays a heavy responsibility on one who would be prophetic.

(5) *The Price of Prophecy:* The ultimate test of the prophet is the price he/she is willing to pay. The prophet is not only called to uprooting injustice in order that new life may come, but is also to suffer the new life in experiencing the death of the old. To accept death is, for Jesus, the seed for new life. "Unless the grain of wheat . . . ."

However, the price the prophet pays *must not* be a self-induced suffering. There can be no masochistic pleasure in it.

To pay a price for one's passion for life is to be creative. The prophet's suffering is always a creative suffering. It radicalizes him/her. It touches him/her at the very heart. Look at how history has been changed by the deaths of Jesus; of John Kennedy; of Martin Luther King, Jr.; or of the imprisonment of Malcolm X, of Eldridge Cleaver, of the Berrigans.

Conclusion

We are all called to a single vocation—that of building up life in ourselves and others. Those who respond by throwing themselves into the battle against life's enemies are responding to life radically. This type of response requires the knowledge of when to say "Yes" and when to say "No." Potential prophets need to stand together as a people in support of one another; not only because persons are too weak to endure individually, but especially because it is more satisfying to be in relationship. Where human life and its mysteries are engaged for their own sake and enjoyed for their own sake and where all-out effort is made to share this gift more broadly, there the Spririt is breathing "unutterable groans beseeching God for us." This is prophecy at its best.

Prophecy understood as a radical response to life says:

A new commandment has been given us: Love your life with
all your strength and energy, grow daily in your appreciation
of the joys of life; and you shall allow and assist where possible

---

[8]Marcel, MB, II 101, as referred to in Hocking *The Meaning of God*, p. 439.

your neightbor to love his life, and do the same, using common norms of justice to determine life priorities. Live to make life livable, fighting when necessary, learning by whatever means possible, having a good time when it is appropriate. Respect life's mysteries in an active rather than a passive manner. In short, love God and live life to the fullest.

Russian Religious Thought Today
As Revealed by Alexander Solzhenitsyn

Chaplain (CPT) Ronald Lee Cobb

Most military chaplains in the United States are partially aware of the continued vitality of religious life in Russia. Despite several decades of living under the official doctrine of Marxist atheism, the religious communities in European communist countries and Russia have remained, and in some cases experienced a steady growth.

Many American military chaplains may not be fully aware of the breadth and depth of religious life in the societies of these lands. Chaplains may be called upon by their commanders to explain the religious attitudes and beliefs of the communist and non-communist peoples in these countries in the event of war or certain peace-time operations. In these situations, the attitudes of the ordinary Russian soldier regarding religion will also be of importance.

The writings of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, internationally known author and Russian dissenter now living in the United States, are in many ways typical of the present religious situation in Russia. It should be remembered that Solzhenitsyn is an outspoken dissenter and that those persons who still reside in Russia, whose thoughts correspond with him on religion and culture, are necessarily much quieter about their beliefs. It should also be remembered that many citizens of the Soviet Union tacitly agree with the general thrust of Russian life—although they may continue to hold unspoken religious and theological opinions which differ greatly from the official doctrine of *Pravda*.

Born after the 1917 revolution and raised by non-religious parents in southern Russia, Solzhenitsyn knew no other theology or political theory but communism and grew into young manhood as what may be termed an agnostic socialist. Although he was never a member of the Russian Communist Party, he basically believed in its doctrines and goals.

While serving as a Captain (the U.S. Army equivalent of Major) in the artillery against the German Army in World War II, he was wrenched from his front-line slot, stripped of his rank, and thrown into prison for joking remarks about Stalin in a letter to a friend. As he saw the injustices, weaknesses, and excesses of Russian communism first hand in prison life and he thought of all the propaganda that he had been raised on, he moved from a general communist idealogy into a viable Christian theology. He was also greatly influenced by the Christian men and women he met in prison. "Thank God for prison! It gave me a chance to think."[1] "There are moments when I say, 'God bless you, prison'."[2]

Solzhenitsyn's two massive volumes, *Gulag Archipelago I & II,* deal exclusively\with prison life in the "islands" of the prison system. Prison is the only place in Russia where free speech exists today, Solzhenitzyn says. A large percentage of Russians, possibly as many as one out of ten, have been in the prison system—most of them for political transgressions (like Solzhenitsyn) rather than criminal acts. Millions and millions of persons, male and female, have been torn from their families and friends; yet in these prisons, separated from every thing but their own humanity, countless numbers of Russians like Solzhenitsyn have found a faith in God. In some cases, individual prisons have become literal centers of evangelism is Russian society.

Through the many characters in his writings, it is possible to see Solzhenitsyn's theology develop. Solzhenitsyn himself says that he is revealed through the experiences he portrays in the persons he writes about. Speaking of one of his short stories he said that in it, "All I saw and experienced is reflected." When a reporter asked him about the details of his thought and theology, Solzhenitsyn told him that everything he had to say about these things, all the details, were to be read in his writings. What Solzhenitsyn writes is almost certainly what continues to take place in the minds and lives of many Russians today, both in prison and out of prison.

As an adolescent, Solzhenitsyn became aware of the simple truth that Stalin was a cruel heartless dictator.[3] He longed for a day when he could fully understand what was truly happening to Russian society. Prison gave him his opportunity. It thrust him in with people from all the purges and whims of Stalin's brutality. Many of his writings therefore dwell on the somber side of human existence.

His entire novel, *The First Circle,* is based on the concept of hell as defined by Dante. It is the story of how the inmates of a scientific research prison had risen to the "best and highest circle—the First Circle"[4] in hell because they were technically skilled scientists. Even in one of the darkest

---

[1]*The First Circle,* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 38.

[2]*Candle in the Wind,* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1973), p. 24.

[3]*The First Circle,* p. 235. Loneliness is one of the many minor themes running throughout most of Solzhenitsyn's writings: loneliness because of physical confinement; loneliness from a lack of kindred spirits; or the loneliness of honesty among dishonesty.

[4]*The First Circle,* p. 9.

moments of the book, Solzhenitsyn has an engineer quote a text from the Orthodox Catechism:

> If I ascend to heaven
> You are there. If down to hell,
> You are there. And if I should
> descend to the depths of the sea,
> there too, Your right hand will reach me.[5]

In many regards, the religious thinking of Solzhenitsyn is very mystical, quite unlike most religious styles in the West, except for the monastic tradition in Catholicism, the Charismatic movement, and the Hasidic movement in Judaism. Like a monk, "a prisoner's heart is so inclined toward mysticism that he accepts precognition almost without surprise."[6] Solzhenitsyn's mysticism is a theology of the inner self, where the deep inward principles of how a person lives in his hidden nature are "the highest criteria of good and evil."[7] His is not a simplistic theology, but a very realistic mysticism. He acknowledges that the good/evil conflict within each human heart is difficult and at times unclear, but strongly states that people should never violate their inner self.[8]

As one studies his writings, it becomes clear that he does not say that he has always followed that which is good. He does not place himself on a pedestal. In fact, he openly confesses that he has repeatedly disobeyed his conscience. Like St. Paul, he is "pressing on" toward the goal of following what is good. Like St. Paul he is also opinionated and dogmatic.

Solzhenitsyn encourages not only individuals but also societies and nations to stand on the side of "the good" in the struggle between good and evil. He laments, "If it were only so simple! If only there were evil people somewhere insidiously committing evil deeds, and it were necessary only to separate them from the rest of us and destroy them."[9] He says that this is impossible since the good/evil conflict lurks within each human heart. He does not use this as an excuse for individuals and societies, but encourages them both to continue to struggle for that which is good—even though it is a complex and difficult struggle.

Many penetrating religious questions about Russian society appear in Solzhentisyn's writings. The Mongols from the east ruled Russia for a thousand years and he asks,

> Was our country ever Christian in its soul? Do you really think that during the thousand years of the church's existence people really forgave the oppressors? Or that they loved those who hated us?[10]

---

[5] *The First Circle*, p. 347 (Psalm 139).

[6] *Gulag Archipelago*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1973) p. 274.

[7] *The First Circle*, p. 573, 643. This exact statement is repeated twice and may indicate Solzhenitzyn's concern to state his point.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 397.

[9] *Gulag Archipelago*, p. 168.

[10] *August 1914*, (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1972), p. 550.

These are questions many thinking Christians in Russia probably have asked also, since questions of this nature relate not only to Russian Orthodoxy or Russian Protestantism or Judaism but to religious thinking around the world. Because of the breadth of his theological musings, Solzhenitsyn is a theologian and writer of world scope. This non-sectarian tendancy religiously and even politically is underscored by the fact that he rejects both communism and capitalism. There are many Christians and persons of all faiths on both sides of the idealogical struggle who would agree. As evangelist Billy Graham said after a trip to Hungary, "I am convinced that Christianity can exist regardless of the political system which it is under."

Solzhenitsyn frequently takes a stand against materialism (capitalism). His writings stress the importance of inner freedom from possessions and property:

> Own nothing! Possess nothing! Buddah and Christ taught us this . . . why can't we grasp this simple teaching? Can't we understand that with property we destroy our soul?[11]

He then shows the opposite of inner freedom, saying that the inner prison certain people like Stalin had created for themselves was just as bad as being placed in a physical prison. Solzhenitsyn is very aware in his writings that materialism among Party leaders and government officials was just as much a human problem as it was among those in western capitalistic societies. He is advocating a human freedom of the spirit in both communist and capitalist societies and peoples.

In seeking to keep his inner freedom, Solzhenitsyn was one of the first Russian intellectuals to openly criticize Stalin. As part of his policy to break the Stalin cult in the Russia of his day, Premier Nikita Khrushchev allowed Solzhenitsyn's short story, *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich,* to be published. Perhaps another reason Khruschev let the small book be published is that he was raised in the church and was familiar with the Bible, and religious themes frequently appear in that work. As the Premier read the stories of prison, injustice, and of deprivation, he was reportedly so moved as to have tears flow down his face. The political pressure of Khruschev was so great that he was not able to continue his program of de-Stalinization nor to allow Solzhenitsyn to officially publish any of his other works in the Soviet Union.

Solzhenitsyn continued to publically and privately criticize Stalin and the Russian communists repeatedly told him, "Stalin belongs to the world communist movement, how dare you criticize him?" Because Stalin had caused the death and imprisonment of millions of Russians, Solzhenitsyn's reply to these confrontations was generally, "In my opinion all he belongs to is the criminal code."[12] Recent Russian history has

---

[11] *Gulag Archipelago,* p. 510.
[12] *Ibid.,* p. 437.

vindicated Solzhenitsyn's opinion (and apparently the opinion of more and more Russians) by the fact that Stalin's body has now been removed from Red Square and only Lenin's remains are on public display.

When faced with the subject of death, Solzhenitsyn raises some very deep theological questions. These questions and comments are even more remarkable when we consider they were penned in an environment hostile to religious faith: "How should one live in order not to feel regret when one is dying."[13] How are people "cleansed by the closeness of death?"[14] What happens to a person's inner nature? Solzhenitsyn quotes a hospital patient on the threshold of death as saying

> Although you've never counted yourself a Christian . . . all of a sudden you find you've forgiven all those who trespassed against you and bear no ill-will toward those who persecuted you.[15]

Solzhenitsyn clearly states in his writings, "We are *compelled* to construct our philosophy so that it should be valid for death."[16]

Another theological insight into Russian thought found in the writings of Alexander Solzhenitsyn is that every human being, even the worst, has some good in them, some glimmer of being created in the image of God. Every person possesses "an image of perfection which in rare moments emerges before his spiritual gaze."[17] Even the Russian Army officer in charge of a large prison or Stalin himself are not wholly devoid of inner goodness in Solzhenitsyn's writings. Solzhenitsyn says that the common man has "an inner ignorant perfection."[18] This attitude of inner goodness and the image of God in everyone is seen in the words of one of his characters who is on a deathbed:

> Sometimes I feel quite distinctly that what is inside me is not all of me. There's something else, sublime, quite indestructible, some tiny fragment of the universal spirit. Don't you feel that?[19]

One of the theological quests in Solzhenitsyn's writings that most chaplains realize exists not only in Russian hearts but in all human hearts, is the struggle for inner wholeness. Surely many persons in the communist environment, just as in the capitalistic environment, are also searching for this inner wholeness. Always a complex thinker, Solzhenitsyn delineates several ways to attain inner wholeness.

Truth was one of his ways to inner wholeness, and as a writer he felt it was his duty "in all circumstances" to remain truthful. "No one can bar the road to truth, and to advance its cause I am prepared to accept even death."[20] These words may appear melodramatic to placid western ears,

---

[13] *Candle in the Wind*, p. 123.
[14] *First Circle*, p. 333.
[15] *Cancer Ward*, p. 31.
[16] *Candle in the Wind*, p. 111.
[17] *First Circle*, p. 297.
[18] Georg Lukas, *Solzhenitsyn*, (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1969) p. 82.
[19] *Cancer Ward*, p. 483.
[20] Leopold Labedz, *Solzhenitsyn, A Documentary Record*, p. 87.

where religious persecution is relatively mild and the political and even criminal systems seem tilted in favor of the individual. But in a communist environment, all systems are tilted in favor of the state and the individual suffers, particularly in the areas of freedom of the printed page and of religion.

Thus, Solzhenitsyn's concept of truth was more than a historical truth, but also a metaphysical and a moral truth. "I live only once and I want to act in accordance with absolute truth."[21] Elsewhere he says, "I promise . . . never to betray the truth."[22] "Truth," absolutes, and promises to perfect behavior seem rather old fashioned to many in the relativistic West, and one must remember that Solzhenitsyn views himself somewhat of an Old Testament prophet to Russian society after the manner of Leo Tolstoy.

In his writings he sees flaws in all political systems, and he uses his conscience, rather than the systems, to judge moral issues. Truth was something universal. It was possessed by all human beings to a greater or lesser degree. Truth was an ultimate concern. "If the first tiny droplet of trust has exploded like a psychological bomb [possibly he was referring to the truth about Stalin's mass-murders and his many acts of villainy], what will happen in our Country when whole waterfalls of Truth burst forth? And they will burst forth. It has to happen."[23]

Another more important way to inner wholeness for Solzhenitsyn was love. This emphasis on love is a fragment of Russian religious thought that was especially reinforced by the life and teachings of Leo Tolstoy. Solzhenitsyn's religious, philosophical, and political attitudes are a continuation of Tolstoy's tradition. This is not to downgrade the originality of Solzhenitsyn's thought, for he himself openly acknowledged that Leo Tolstoy was his spiritual mentor. Although the two men were never personally acquainted, Solzhenitsyn imbibed heavily of Tolstoy's life and thought. Tolstoy is about the only person Solzhenitsyn continually mentions as influencing his thinking. He says that although Tolstoy rejected man's church, (as many Russians have rejected the organized Orthodox or Baptist Churches but still continue to be "underground" believers), "he failed to take into account its mystical and organizational role."[24] Although Tolstoy rejected the Bible, Solzhenitsyn feels that modern science really does not conflict with the Biblical record. Thus, even though Tolstoy influences Solzhenitsyn, it is also clear that Solzhenitsyn is not uncritical when he evaluates the ideas of Tolstoy.

The Russian novelist, Leo Tolstoy, lived from 1828 to 1910 and was a reformer and a moral thinker just as Solzhenitsyn. Stalin did what he could to erase the memory of Tolstoy from the Russian mind, but he lingers on in the thoughts of many Russian intellectuals and religious thinkers.

---

[21] *Candle in the Wind,* p. 56
[22] Labedz, *Documentary Record,* p. 179.
[23] *Gulag Archipelago,* p. 298.
[24] *Ibid.,* p. 613.

There are many similarities between Tolstoy and Solzhenitsyn. Both were soldiers and grew up in southern Russia. Tolstoy was engaged in several battles in the Caucasus Mountains between 1851-1856 against the hill tribes. Solzhenitsyn was an artillery officer on the Western front against Germany in World War II and a brave soldier in combat. After the war, Tolstoy developed into a rather rugged individualist as did Solzhenitsyn after his combat and prison experiences. Solzhenitsyn's critics in the Soviet Writers' Union joked that Solzhenitsyn held Tolstoy in such high regard that he grew a beard so that he could resemble his hero.

In 1879 Tolstoy finally found what he considered to be the meaning of life. Solzhenitsyn always asks this same question in his major writings, "What is the meaning of life?" Tolstoy came to the ultimate conclusion that the answers to his search for the meaning of life could be found in the teachings of Christ and that this type of love was the only full answer. Tolstoy taught "that the way to a true knowledge of Christ and to salvation was through individual conscience and love . . . ."[25]

At the beginning of his great military novel about World War I, *August 1914*, Solzhenitsyn has a Russian lad named Sanya ask Tolstoy, "What is the aim of man's life on earth?"[26] Tolstoy answers, "To serve good and thereby to build the kingdom of heaven on earth." The young man asks Tolstoy how this can be done, and the old "gray-bearded Sage" answers, "Only through love." "Only?" questions the lad, "Are you sure you've not exaggerated the power of love inherent in man, or at least in modern man?. . . Because as far as I can see, where we are in the South there simply isn't any universal good will, Lev Nikolaevich, none at all!"

Without any hesitation, Tolstoy looks straight into Sanya's eyes and with all the force of his personality replies, "Only through love! Nothing else. No one will ever discover anything better." It is obvious that Solzhenitsyn believes Tolstoy's words. It is also clear that Solzhenitsyn is a distinct person and possesses a distinct theology from Tolstoy despite the parallels in their lives and thoughts.

U. S. military chaplains may well wonder if Tolstoy and Solzhenitsyn and persons like them can greatly influence the life of the average Russian soldier since their writings are censored in present-day Russian culture. In Moscow and the larger Russian cities, loosely-knit underground publishing and literature distribution networks provide many banned novels and plays to their adherents—adherents who are often surprisingly high in the framework of the governmental and military superstructure. Before he was allowed to leave Russia, Solzhenitsyn complained that many typewritten copies of his novels had already circulated throughout the intellectual circles of Moscow long before they were published in the West and that some of these pirated versions contained numerous typographical

---

[25] David Burg, *Solzhenitsyn*, p. 15.
[26] From *August 1914* (all of the following quotations are from pages 17-18).

errors and omissions. This means that some political leaders and military officers of Russia are directly influenced by religious dissenters such as Tolstoy and Solzhenitsyn.

The Russian religious community also has many ways of surreptitiously publishing and distributing religious literature, hymnbooks, passages from the Bible, and Sunday school materials. Often page after page of Scripture is copied in longhand. Sometimes a typewriter is available. Infrequently, a small, hidden printing press is obtained. Many hand-written Bibles exist, especially common are entirely hand-written New Testaments. Complete copies of printed Bibles are so strictly limited in Eastern Europe and particularly Russia that these hand-written Bibles are treasured beyond words. Many of the passages and chapters automatically are committed to memory because of the number of times they have been written and re-written.

Western military leaders should also be aware that religious suppression is not entirely uniform in Eastern Europe or even in Russia. Just the fact that Alexander Solzhenitsyn was allowed to write and to live in Russia after his first work was published, gives testimony to the fact that governmental attitudes toward freedom of speech and religion can wax and wane. Even Stalin, when faced with the invasion from Germany, relaxed his opposition to the Russian Orthodox Church when he saw the basic national loyalty exhibited in the church leadership and laity.

Some cities and villages have a very benign attitude toward Christians, Jews, and Muslims. This seems to be particularly true in rural Russian life. In fact, in some of these localities, the majority of the population are active Christians or Muslims and the civil authorities do little to stop the spread of religion and even cooperate with the local religious leaders. This fact is undoubtedly due to the high percentage of religious people in that district with which the local political leader must deal each working day, but it may also be that the leader himself is a secret believer or was raised by a godly mother or grandmother. From the scores and scores of believers Solzhenitsyn mentions that he encounters in every prison, one becomes very much aware of the widespread faith in God existing throughout the length and breadth of Russia today.

In advising their commanders about Russian religion and culture, U. S. military chaplains should assume that a sizeable but indeterminable percentage of the enlisted men in the Russian Army possess some form or semblance of a faith in God. Solzhenitsyn's military work, *August 1914,* makes this very clear as he mentions one soldier after another who was active in the Russian Orthodox Church and who knew the creed well, reciting lengthy passages from the creed and scriptures in their conversations, at the death of a friend on the battlefield, or praying with them in a moment of crisis. The fact that most of the Russian Army comes from small towns, villages and rural areas where religious faith is less suppressed indicates that a significant number of those in the Russian military are not atheists.

The civilian population of Russia and their religious attitudes are another area where the chaplain should be informed. Russian churches are full of women, since widows or wives are less subject to oppression or job discrimination for their faith. Solzhenitsyn shows a great deal of respect for the women who were thrown into prison because of their religious faith. He relates how the men of the prisons respected them highly, ragarding them as they would "nuns." "For Solzhenitsyn it is frequently in old peasant women that true spirituality is found."[27] "The old women were bolder than the rest. You couldn't turn them bad. They believe in God. And they would break off a piece of bread from their meager loaf and throw it to us [prisoners]... and the holy bread, broken in two, was left to lie in the dust while we were driven off."[28]

This story about the broken bread uses a familiar Russian religious symbol, Holy Communion. This symbol can be seen again in his description of a typical prison meal. "Remember that thin, watery soup or the oatmeal porridge without a single drop of fat? Can you say that you *eat* it. No. You commune with it, you take it like a sacrament."[29]

Here are two references in Solzhenitsyn's writings in which Holy Communion is used as a means of describing the importance of an event. This gives us some insight into how Orthodox Russian believers feel inwardly about their faith. It also reveals to us how another Russian citizen views the religious life of his land.

Solzhenitsyn's faith in God and his revelations about the continued existence of religious belief in Russia should not make us unrealistically optimistic about the present situation. Official organizations and societies continue to exist whose avowed goals are to promote atheism and to denigrate religion. These societies exist not only among the ranks of the K.G.B. (secret police) and the Russian Army, but also among all levels of civilian society. Religious faith is not officially favored and will not be favored in the foreseeable future—since it breeds independent thinking and loyalties which go beyond the loyalities of state government, nationality, and culture. Russian communism claims to be an ultimate concern just as does faith in God. It is, in fact, a virtual religion, with official Party theologians constantly molding and remolding this official dogma.

But the officially recognized religious communities and the underground religious communities are thorns in the flesh of the Russian communists. These people are living proof that the totalitarian government is not total and that faith in God continues to be actively sustained. Christ's words that "man shall not live by bread alone" apply to the current religious situation in Russia. More than class equality and scientific socialism are being sought by persons in Russia today and the U.S. military chaplain should be cognizant that his role may one day place him in a position of providing for the needs of Russian Christians, Jews, and Muslims, to

---

[27] *Candle in the Wind*, p. 16.
[28] *Gulag Archipelago*, p. 525.
[29] *The First Circle*, p. 38.

understand their current problems, and to be able to inform his commander about Russian culture and religious life. Solzhenitsyn is clearly revealing the top of the iceberg. A deeply ingrained faith in God continues to exist in Russia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burg, David and Feifer, George. *Solzhenitsyn*. New York: Stein and Day Publishers, 1972.

Labedz, Leopold. *Solzhenitsyn, A Documentary Record*. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Lukas, Georg. *Solzhenitsyn*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M. I. T. Press, 1969.

Solzhenitsyn, Alexander. *August 1914*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, Inc., 1972.

_____ *Cancer Ward*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, Inc., 1969.

_____ *Candle in the Wind*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1973.

_____ *The First Circle*. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

_____ *The Gulag Archipelago*. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

_____ *The Love-Girl and the Innocent*. London: The Bodley Head Ltd., 1969.

_____ *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1963.

_____ *A Pictorial Autobiography*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux Inc., 1974.

_____ *Stories and Prose Poems*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, Inc., 1970.

The Contextual Ethic of Karl Barth

Chaplain (MAJ) Melvin L. Rogers

The title of this article may cause a variety of reactions, but as the writer researched various materials it seemed appropriate in light of Karl Barth's theological method. Harvey Cox, with reference to Joseph Fletcher's "Situation Ethics," stated,

> No one knows better than Joseph Fletcher himself that there is nothing new about the "new morality." No one recognizes more clearly that "situationism" is merely an arbitrary designation for an ethical tradition whose roots reach back to the beginnings of the Western morality itself.[1]

A situation ethic is considered to be a contextual ethic and thus aptly described as contextualism, but not all contextualists are identical. As James B. Nelson wrote, ". . . one can err by assuming that all contextualists are saying virtually the same thing."[2] It is out of this frame of reference that the writer assumes Karl Barth is a contextualist, and therefore implies a situational ethic. His theological concepts lead the writer to believe Barth adopted this as his Christian ethic, although not specifically labeled as such in his writings. Of course, before one determines that a person is a contextualist, one must explain what is meant by contextualism. Harvey Seifert spoke to this when he stated,

> A great deal depends upon what we mean by contextualism. If one means that for moral choice it is necessary to take into account the realities of the existing situation, there can be no moral quarrel with the position. It is indeed necessary to gather data, recognize facts, and do empirical research. Before one makes a political decision he had better study the political situation. Before adopting an economic policy he had better become familiar with economic theory. In this sense any responsible person is a contextualist.[3]

[1]Harvey Cox, "Introduction And Perspective" *The Situation Ethics Debate*, ed. Harvey Cox (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), p. 9.

[2]James B. Nelson, "Contextualism And The Ethical Triad" *The Situation Ethics Debate*, ed. Harvey Cox (Philadelphia: Westminster 1968), p. 171.

[3]Harvey Seifert, "The Promise And Peril of Contextualism" *The Situation Ethics Debate*, ed. Harvey Cox (Philadelphia; Westminster, 1968), p. 224.

Chaplain Rogers is pastor of the Woodland Heights Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Missouri. He is one of the chaplains in the 45th Inf Bde (Sep) Oklahoma Army National Guard, and is attached to the 1st Battalion, 279th Infantry, Tulsa,Oklahoma. He holds the degrees of BA from Northeastern State, Tahlequah, Oklahoma; the BD from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas; the D Min from the Graduate Seminary, Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma; and has received his diploma from the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas.

It would be a faulty judgment to accuse all contextualists to be of the same philosophy. Therefore, it would be a mistake to assume that Karl Barth and Joseph Fletcher are identical in their contextual or situation ethic. The writer is not attempting to make these assumptions, but is only attempting to state that Barth's Christian ethic is one of contextualism or situationism. However, the ideas of Barth and Fletcher do run parallel at various times in discussing the Christian ethic. Joseph Fletcher stated,

> The old morality with its classical absolutes and universals is a form of Pharisaism. . . . The new morality, for which situation ethics is the appropriate method, follows love (freedom to put human need before anything else), staying as close to law as possible yet departing as far from it as need be. Jesus taught this situationist kind of freedom from moral law. He held that morals were made for man, not man for morals.[4]

It is the writer's opinion that Barth's Christian ethic could be stated in the following manner, borrowing the sentence structure from Fletcher:

> 'The old morality with its classical absolutes and universals is a form of Pharisaism. . . . The Christian's moral responsibility in ethical decisions and behavior, for which contextualism is an appropriate method, follows the revelation of the Word of God (freedom to be and freedom to put human need before anything else), staying as close to law as possible yet departing as far from it as need be. Jesus lived and taught this contextual ethic, and kind of freedom from the imprisonment of moral law, for He held that morals were made for man, not man for morals.'

The writer is quite sure that Barth and Fletcher would probably not agree with his assumptions, but nevertheless this is where the writer sees Barth in relation to Fletcher. In referring to the moral responsibility of the Church in its mission, Barth states,

> . . . the Church must concentrate first on the lower and lowest levels of human society. The poor, the socially and economically weak and threatened, will always be the object of its primary and particular concern, and it will always insist on the State's special responsibility for these weaker members of society.[5]

If we take the words of Barth seriously we will be inevitably forced into ethical decisions concerning violence, and, or, non-violence. The writer sees no other alternative if the Christian takes his or her moral responsibility seriously. To avoid this confrontation, or crisis decision, would be to turn away from the plow and look back with cowardly insecurity. Holmes Rolston, writing in the inevitability of that which has just been mentioned, and referring to the thought of Barthian's, stated,

> According to them we must distinguish between the ideal situation and the real situation. The ideal for society, for example, is the attainment of a situation in which the use of force is unnecessary. Most men do not refrain

---

[4]Joseph Fletcher, "Reflection and Reply" *The Situation Ethics Debate,* ed., Harvey Cox (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), p. 249.

[5]Karl Barth, *Against the Stream* (London: SCM Press, 1954), p. 36.

from stealing from the fear of the law but from their inner sense of honesty. And yet there are some men who cannot be restrained by this inner sense of honor. The only thing that will appeal to them is force and fear. As long as such men exist, society cannot fail to use a certain measure of force in the punishment of the thief. The ideal, of course, is a world in which the police force could be abolished because it was unnecessary, but with the world as it is a police force is a necessity. Presumably, he [Barth] would take the same attitude toward war. The ideal, of course, is a world in which men live together in peace.[6]

Thus, the writer contends that the Christian ethic of Barth, in his contextual approach, allows room for violence as a last resort, in order that the purpose and will of God would be accomplished in history. In the following, the writer will attempt to present Barth's concept of the Christian ethic which could possibly be applied in every moral decision confronted by the believer in Jesus Christ.

Christian Ethic in Response to the Word of God: A Call of Freedom

Karl Barth stated:

The destiny of man is to be allowed by God to be free, to believe, to love and to hope. That is what the revelation of God has to tell man about himself, about his past, present and future. The revelation of God means that man is destined for faith, for freedom and therefore for God. The freedom of God is to become free for God.[7]

Man, in his fallen nature, is not free but is imprisoned within himself. There is a wall of separation between man, in his unregenerate state, and God. The revelation of the Word of God, God in Jesus Christ, comes to man in spite of the wall between man and God in order that man may respond and dissolve the wall of separation. God comes to man to give him freedom and permission to participate in His cause. This is, in effect, a call of freedom brought about in the Word of God. Barth wrote,

Christian faith is the illumination of the reason in which men become free to live in the truth of Jesus Christ and thereby to become sure also of the meaning of their own existence and of the ground and goal of all that happens.[8]

It is totally impossible for man to exercise freedom in and of himself, for freedom to be comes from outside of man, even in Jesus Christ. A Christian ethic for man therefore is in response to the revelation of the Word of God, a response to freedom, a call to be. Herbert Hartwell wrote of Barth's teaching and said,

God's command is man's liberation to a life lived in the joyful freedom of the

---

[6]Holmes Rolston, *A Conservative Looks To Barth and Brunner* (Nashville: Cokesbury, 1933) p. 166.

[7]Barth, *Against The Stream,* p. 237.

[8]Karl Barth, *Dogmatics In Outline* (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), p. 22.

children of God who by the "totally unmerited and wondrous" gift of freedom are awakened to true selfhood and new life.[9]

As man responds to the revelation of God in Christ he is recreated in the image of God as God intended man to be. Writing of this freedom, Barth stated,

> Great stress must be laid on this concept of freedom. We are living today in an age of much constraint and compulsion and fear and we have every reason to hearken to the words: "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."[10]

Man is called to be free in Christ, but what is the purpose for that new birth of freedom? Is man's freedom to be an end in itself, or, is the revelation of the Word of God to be an end in itself? Barth tells us that "freedom means freedom for God and for one's neighbor."[11] This means, therefore, that man's call of freedom in response to the Word of God is a call to proclaim the Word of God to all men, even as God assumed responsibility for all men. Referring to this call of the Chruch to moral responsibility, Christian ethics, Barth tells us,

> The Church cannot make an absolute principle of its freedom. . . . Its freedom is based on but also restricted by its mission, which is to preach the Word of God to man. . . . It can therefore not fail to take an interest in the rights and wrongs of man, in his weal and woe. . . . No guarantee of its own freedom would justify it leaving the world in the lurch in the critical situation caused by political changes. . . . If it thinks that its duty is to keep out in certain circumstances, the reason must not on any account be a fear of soiling its hands.[12]

The believer, in the freedom which God has given to him in Christ, is therefore called to serve God by ministering to others. A violation of this call would be a denial of the freedom which God has given to man.

> Just as man is shown to be determined for God, so he is shown to be determined for his fellow-men. The basic form of humanity, Barth claims is co-humanity.[13]

In man's call of freedom, the believer is called to stand in time as a person who has been laid hold of by eternity, and who is to proclaim and to bear witness against the form of this world in favor of the form of another world, even eternity itself. Therfore, Christian man, in the infinite mercy of God is given the high privilege of, in some measure, sharing with God in Christ the great challenge and task of bringing the world under the dominion of God. Christian man has, therefore, been called out of this world into another world, in the freedom and for the freedom of Christ—only to be called back to this world, to be set in the midst of this evil world, and told to bear himself within it as the man whom God has claimed for Himself:

---

[9]Herbert Hartwell, *The Theology of Karl Barth* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), pp. 161-2.
[10]Barth, *Against The Stream*, p. 235.
[11]*Ibid.*, p. 61.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 87
[13]Hartwell, *The Theology of Karl Barth*, p. 129.

To have inner ears for the Word of Christ, to become thankful for His work and at the same time responsible for the message about Him, and, lastly, to take confidence in men for Christ's sake—that is the freedom which we obtain, when Christ breathes on us, when He sends us His Holy Spirit. If He no longer lives in a historical or heavenly, a theological or ecclesiastical remoteness from me, if He approaches me and takes possession of me, the result will be that I hear, that I am thankful and responsible and that finally I may hope for myself and for all others; in other words, that I may live in a Christian way.[14]

It is a sad commentary on the Church today that those who claim they are believers and followers of Christ have failed in the call of freedom to respond. Instead, they continue to mouth words of intention from within their own imprisonment of being. Helmut Thielicke referred to this when he wrote,

The Church has not taken the Lord's command to "love thy neighbor" as a concrete commission to change a blatantly unjust social situation. No, the decisive impulses for change have come from within the ranks of the oppressed and humiliated themselves.[15]

A Call of Obedience

We are told that the Fall of man occurred because of man's disobedience, and as a result the image of God in man was broken and tarnished. A Christian ethic in response to the Word of God is obedience, and this is a matter of faith and trust. Barth centered in on obedience quite heavily when he wrote,

Faith is obedience, not just a passive accomodation of oneself. Where there is obedience, there is also choice on man's part; faith is chosen instead of its opposite unbelief, trust instead of distrust, knowledge instead of ignorance. Faith means choosing between faith and unbelief, wrong belief and superstition. Faith is the act in which man relates himself to God as is appropriate to God. For this work takes place in a stepping out of neutrality towards God, out of any disavowal of obligation towards Him in our existence and attitude, out of the private sphere, into resoluteness, responsibility and public life.[16]

Christian man is called by God to be obedient and to actively participate in the intercourse between God and man. Thus God not only permits man's free and responsible decision and action but calls for it and even demands it. Barth wrote,

... the call of Jesus Christ is decisively an invitation and demand that the men to whom it comes should adopt a particular inward and outward line of action and conduct of which we have the basic form in the twofold command to love God and our neighbors and a normative description in the imperatives of the Sermon on the Mount or the admonitions of the apostolic Epistle. And the

---

[14]Barth, *Dogmatics in Outline*, p. 139.
[15]Helmut Thielicke, *Theological Ethics*, Vol 2 (Philadelphia; Fortress Press, 1969), p. 628.
[16]Barth, *Dogmatics In Outline*, p. 29.

Christian is the man who gladly accepts the invitation and demand as a binding Word of the Lord, and stirs himself to obey and do justice to it.[17]

The writer understands Barth to be implying, in somewhat militaristic terminology, that God, as the Commanding Officer, in His calling of man, demands of man, in response to Him, complete submission and obedience. This would mean therefore that a Christian ethic in response to the Word of God, in obedience to the call of God, would be involved in sharing God's message and will to all men. If man believes and trusts in God as the ultimate in reliability he would not only gladly accept God's invitation to love his neighbors, but would be quick to volunteer for duty on the "front lines" of the battle zone of man's being and existence. "That man who refuses to listen and obey the Word acts not as a freeman but as a slave, for there is no freedom except through God's Word."[18] Christian ethics, in response to God's revelation, connects the call of freedom and obedience together, for until man is free he cannot be obedient. The man who does not obey God's call is therefore not free. The writer would assume that Barth would believe that freedom demands responsibility, for only as man is free can he be responsible. Through God's call of freedom man is also given the call to obedient, responsible use of freedom. Helmut Thielicke, the writer believes, referred to the responsible use of freedom when he wrote,

> Where I act out of sheer necessity my act has no ethical quality. Indeed to the extent that it involves more acquiescence in something which runs counter to my own conviction, it is ethically dubious.[19]

The writer assumes Thielicke's statement to mean that man in his disobedience to God's revelation is not free, and therefore, any decision which man might make out of sheer necessity, or even self-preservation, would have no ethical value. Obedience to God comes only from the freedom to which man is called by God. If man's obdience does not come from his freedom to be, then his pseudo obedience is only a form of slavery to a tyrannical dictator; not a loving obedience wrought from a loving relationship with God. Thus, for man to be forced to do good to his neighbor, because he is not free to do good to his neighbor in loving obedience to God, is not Christian ethics, but an additional hardship to his imprisonment and slavery.

> The task of theological ethics is to understand the Word of God as the command of God. Its fundamental, simplest and comprehensive answer to the ethical problem is that man's action is good in so far as it is sanctified by the Word of God which as such is also the command of God. . . . Man's action is good in so far as he is the obedient hearer of the Word and command of God. The hearing and obeying which proceeds from and by the Word of God is man's sanctification. Ethics has to understand the Word of God as the fulness, measure, and source of this sanctification. Ethics has to understand the Word of God as the fulness, measure, and source of this sanctification.[20]

[17]Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, Vol 4 (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1962), pp. 558-9.
[18]Karl Barth, *Evangelical Theological* (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1964), p. 15.
[19]Helmut Thielicke, *Theological Ethics*, Vol 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 415.
[20]Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, Vol 3 (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1967), p. 4.

Christian Ethic In Response To The Need of Man: Determined By Specific Circumstances

As to the ethical use of violence or non-violence by the Christian in response to the need of man, Barth is definitely a contextualist, in that the Christian ethic is determined in part by specific circumstances. The writer believes that Barth speaks to reality rather than submersing his head in the sand in idealistic resignation.

> It is the choosing of the path which in a particular situation the Christian sees to be the will of God for him. Christian faith never forgets the ideal, but it does not become so absorbed in the contemplation of the ideal that it forgets the real. In harmony with this thought Brunner would say that you cannot work out any program that would be of universal application. Circumstances alter cases.[21]

For a person to assume that a contextualist or a situationist has buried his ideals in Christian ethics would be an asinine presumption, for as Rolston has written,

> ... it is just possibly that the message of Christ to the men of every age may be touched with a holy realism that bids them undertake in his name the duties that arise in their particular world situation without at the same time working these duties into a program which shall be binding on all men in every age.[22]

It is true, without exception, that every believer and follower of Christ, in response to God's revelation, desires that the world live in peace. For one to be without this ideal in his or her being would mean a false confession of Christ as Lord and Savior, but at the same time, the believer has been called and set in a world corrupted by man and is vividly aware of the reality of the world, if his eyes are not covered by blinders. Man, in his corrupt and fallen nature, does not know of, nor does he seek, the peace ideal as one who is in Christ. From a biological perspective, Author Koestler speaks to the nature of man is his unnatural, or corrupt nature.

> ... the native equipment of homo sapiens may contain some built-in error or deficiency that would pre-dispose him to self-destruction. More precisely, that evolution has equipped our species with a type of brain in which affect-based beliefs are dissociated from and in perpetual conflict with the reasoning intellect. The result, as we see it, is a split-minded or schizophrenic mentality, which seems to be inherent in man's condition and is reflected in his absurd and tortured history. If this diagnosis is correct—and I think there is sufficient evidence from both history and neuro-physiology to support it—then we would at least have a realistic base line to start the search for a cure.[23]

With the above in mind, and the biblical evidence of fallen man's corrupt nature, the Christian has no alternative but to realize that the power of evil is energetically alive in the world seeking every opportunity to devour those

---

[21]Rolston, *A Conservative Looks to Barth and Brunner*, p. 167.

[22]*Ibid.*, p. 172.

[23]Author Koestler, "The Predicament of Man" *Alternatives To Violence*, ed. Larry Ng (New York: Time Life Books, 1968), p. 17.

who would succumb. Idealism, in and of itself, is, in the writer's opinion, a "cop-out," a cowardly and disobedient, as well as an unloving philosophy, to avoid battle and confrontation for the sake of those being devoured. Thielicke spoke of this when he said,

> To suffer evil without resisting it is to push it to the recklessness of even greater aggression, and to furnish it with the illusion of supposed validity. The Stuttgart Declaration of guilt of 1945 correctly acknowledges that the totalitarian state would not have reached this extreme of demonic corruption had Christians taken more seriously their duty of resistance and obeyed unconditionally the imperative to resist injustice in its first beginnings.[24]

If the Church is to be free and obedient to God in positive response to God's revelation, and is to proclaim the Word of God to man, and be responsive to the need of man in an ethical relationship, the Christian cannot, and will not, in the writer's opinion of Barth's idea, sit back and do nothing about the need of man in an evil world. This would be akin to Thielicke's idea of false conservatism as he indicated, "False conservatism expresses itself in the inclination to accept world conditions as they are."[25] As to Barth's high regard for the Word of God to be the ultimate in authority for Christian responsibility to God and man, the writer acknowledges. However, James M. Gustafson refers to the principle problem that Barth's idea presents.

> The principle problem is to determine how decisive the authority of scripture is for one's moral judgment. Only the two extremes are absolutely precluded: It does not have the authority of verbal inspiration that the religiously conservative defenders of a "revealed morality" would give to it, nor is it totally without relevance to present moral judgments.[26]

In the writer's opinion, as well as in Gustafason's opinion, Barth is definitely a contextualist, as aptly described by Gustafason when he wrote,

> How the various biblical theologies of ethics use the morality or ethical teachings found in scripture is contingent upon methodological choices that can be given both theological and philosophical justification. For example, within Barth's theological ethics, it is the command of God, heard by the moral agent, that determines whether something is right or wrong. But the command is not a capricious one; it is likely to be in accord with the moral teachings of the decalogue and of Jesus. These moral teachings provide "prominent lines"; they are not unexceptional rules or laws of conduct, nor are they moral ideals. They are coherent with the revelation of God in the scriptures; and thus, if one's judgment is not in accord with these prominent lines; it is doubtful whether one is really hearing God's command.[27]

To clarify exactly Barth's Christian ethic in response to the need of man, as determined by specific circumstances, the writer calls attention to Barth's words, speaking to a particular situation:

---

[24]Thielicke, *Theological Ethics,* Vol 2 p. 375.

[25]*Ibid.,* p. 627.

[26]James M. Gustafason, *Theology and Christian Ethics* (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1974), p. 144.

[27]*Ibid.,* pp. 137-138.

. . . violent solutions of conflicts in the political community—from police measures to law court decisions, from the armed rising against a regime that is no longer worthy of or equal to its task the sense of a revolt undertaken not to undermine but to restore the lawful authority of the State) to the definite war against an external threat to the lawful State—must be approved, supported and if necessary even suggested by the Christian community—for how could it possibly contract out in such a situation? On the other hand, it can only regard violent solutions of any conflict as an *ultima ratio regis*. It will approve and support them only when they are for the moment the ultimate and only possibility available. It will always do its utmost to postpone such moments as far as possible. It can never stand for absolute peace, for peace at any price. But must and will do all it can to see that no price is considered too high for the preservation or restoration of peace at home and abroad except the ultimate price which would mean the abolition of the lawful state and the practical denial of the devine ordinance. May the Church show her inventiveness in search for other solutions before she joins in the call for violence.[28]

Rejection Of Naturalism As An Ethic

According to Barth,

> Revelation in the Christian sense means the unveiling of certain facts that are fundamentally hidden from man, things no eye has seen, no ear has heard, no human heart conceived.[29]

This means that Barth rejects any kind of natural theology to reveal God to man, and therefore the Word of God is the only revelation on which a Christian ethic is to be based. Therefore, in lieu of this theological perspective, it would stand to reason that Barth would reject naturalism as an ethic, even though in response to the need of man.

> Barth uses the term "ethics" not in the abstract and neutral sense in which it is generally used, but in the quite specific and concrete sense it receives from the specific object to which it is applied. For the ethical problem he argues, is not posed in a vacuum; we are not free to investigate the question of good and evil in human behavior as if God's revelation in Jesus Christ had never occurred. His ethics arises, as it were, out of man's living encounter in every sphere of his existence with the command of the Living God as the latter is enacted in and through the person and work of the Living Lord Jesus Christ.[30]

It is no secret that the Roman Catholic Church bases much of its ethical positions on naturalism, or natural law, *e.g.,* contraceptives and abortion. What does Barth mean by natural law? In response to this question, Barth responds by stating,

> By "natural law" we mean the embodiment of what man is alleged to regard as universally right and wrong, as necessary, permissible and forbidden by nature; that is, on any conceivable promise.[31]

If the Christian community, or the individual Christian, were to base a

---

[28] Barth, *Against The Stream*, p. 41.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 207.
[30] Hartwell, *The Theology of Karl Barth*, p. 154.
[31] Barth, *Against The Stream*, p. 191.

Christian ethic on so-called natural law it would mean a refusal to build on the foundation with Christ as the center, and therefore fall into the ways of the world. This, the writer believes, runs parallel with what Iris Murdoch wrote concerning "natural law."

> Here the individual is seen as a moving tentatively vis-a-vis a reality which transcends him. To discover what is morally good is to discover that reality, and to become good is to integrate himself with it. He is ruled by laws which he can only partly understand. He is not fully conscious of what he is. His freedom is not an open freedom of choice in a clear situation; it lies rather in an increasing knowledge of his own real being, and in the conduct which naturally springs from such knowledge.[32]

In the writer's opinion, if "natural law" was the only normative ethic for man then, in effect, he is not truly free to be. It may appear on the surface to some that Barth's idea of revelation, and the freedom which God provides man, would only serve in the same capacity as "natural law," but Barth stated, "Man is not compelled to know God, but he is allowed to know God, to trust Him and to obey Him."[33] Natural law, as some would so advocate, leaves no room for the freedom of man in decision, which in effect only restricts man to be a slave imprisoned by the tyranny of the natural world. Gene Outkat stated, "God's loving command is His command and we can never anticipate it or formulate a rule to express it."[34] Barth's Christian ethic is, according to the writer, deontological, an ethics of obedience, which is more interested in the demand of God rather than man. Therefore, with reference to natural law, Barth's idea is very similiar to Kant. For Kant . . .

> contends that since no particular view of the good, no special definition of value, no single end can be justified in such a way that it can be compelling for all men, then by a process of elimination, all that he justified is that each person have a presumptive right to pursue his good freely as he sees it, consistent with the equal right of every other person to do the same. Thus, all restrictions, all constraints on action, are derived from this fundamental right to every person to equal freedom.[35]

Although Barth would no doubt disagree, to some extent, with Kant, yet in the freedom which God gives he allows man to decide in freedom for obedience to his being and calling in Christ. Therefore, Barth rejects the so-called natural law as an ethic for Christians.

> . . . the Protestant ethicist cannot appeal to a fixed and given system of normative principles which would enable him to subsume every concrete case and to deduce concrete directives from guiding principles. Instead, he must find these directives by proceeding from the object of his faith to the concrete facts and then working back from there.[36]

---

[32]Gene Outkat, *Agape* (New Haven: Yal University Press, 1972), p. 191.

[33]Barth, *Against The Stream*, p. 238.

[34]Outkat, *Agape*, p. 229.

[35]David Little, "Some Traditional Approaches To Moral Theory" *Military Chaplains' Review*, (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, Winter 1974), p. 13.

[36]Thielicke, *Theological Ethics*, Vol 2, p. 654.

The world of man, or as some would say, the world of culture has consistently tried to subdue and conquer the ethics of the Christian community with its pagan law of naturalism. In some instances the institutional church has relinquished the authority of the revelation of God for the popularity of man's world, but this is not the true Chruch. When the State, the civil community, determines the ethics of the Church, Christ's community, then it has over stepped its reason for being, and has started on the road to tyranny. The Church has no alternative, if it is to be true to its Lord, but to resist. Rosemary Radford Ruether wrote of Barth,

> Crisis theology thus took its stand on a ridical recovery of the Reformation
> sense of God's transcendence, man's sinfulness, and the tension and antithesis
> between the gospel and culture. Thereby it raised the possibility of the church
> not simply as the ally of established culture and the bearer of the ideology of
> the society in religious terms, but the church as the critic of culture and even a
> standpoint for protest and resistance against the culture.[37]

Conclusion

After working through material concerning Barth's Christian ethic, the writer has affirmed his previous statement that Karl Barth is a contextualist, for as James B. Nelson stated, "Christian contextualism emphasizes the activity of the living God".[38] Because the writer agrees with Barth on his doctrine of Christian revelation, it stands to reason that Barth's Christian ethic is also accepted. Christian ethics is in response to the Word of God and in response to the need of man. The authority is the Word of God, not man, but yet man's needs are of vital significance to God. For example, we are told in the decalogue, "Thou shalt not kill." But is God so cruel and so unloving as to expect or demand that man stand idly by and permit a madman to kill his loved ones, or even himself, and, therefore, add to the possibility that others as well might be destroyed? The writer cannot believe God demands such a response of man in such a situation. Writing of contextualism, Theodore R. Weber wrote,

> This contextual determination of priorities in responsibility is the single most
> effective revealer of one's true identity. It also illustrates the intimate
> connection between ethics and faith.[39]

The writer stated earlier that Fletcher and Barth had something in common, in that both men are contextualists. Joseph Fletcher stated,

> Even Karl Barth, who writes vehemently of "absolutely wrong" actions,
> allows for what he calls the *ultima ratio*, the outside chance that love in a
> particular situation might override the absolute. The instance he gives is
> abortion.[40]

---

[37]Rosemary Radford Ruether, *The Radical Kingdom* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), p. 115.

[38]James B. Nelson, "Contextualism And The Ethical Triad" *The Situation Ethics Debated*, ed. Harvey Cox (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), p. 176.

[39]Theodore R. Weber, "Ethical Theory and Value Education" *Military Chaplains' Review*, (Washington, D.C. Department of Army, Winter, 1974). p. 23.

[40]Fletcher, *Situation Ethics*, p. 33.

The writer, in order to be honest with himself, and to the revelation of God, agrees with Karl Barth's ethical position, for not only does it do justice to the Word of God but also to the need of man. In closing, the writer would like to refer to Barth's ideas once again, and state that Barth's position has become, and is, the writer's position concerning Christian ethics.

> Barth rejects the view of ethics as a fixed set of rules and of God's command as a collection of general precepts the application of which in an individual case would be a matter for man's judgment and action. Such a view, he holds, is a variance with the freedom of God's grace which does not leave to man the final decision of whether in an individual case a command of God is applicable and therefore is to be obeyed by man. In each and every command it is God Himself who actually gives the command and in so doing gives Himself to be man's Commander so that man can only obey or disobey the command in question. . . . On the other hand, though there are many particularly divine commands, they have their unity in Jesus Christ who is the same yesterday, today and forever. Again, they serve, all of them, one and the same purpose. Namely the actualization of God's eternal decree before time, in other words, the establishment between God and man in Jesus Christ.[41]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barth, Karl. *Against The Stream,* London: SCM Press, 1954.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics,* Vol. 4 Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1962.

Barth, Karl. *Dogmatics In Outline.* New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Barth, Karl. *Evangelical Theology,* Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1964.

Cox, Harvey, "Introduction and Perspective" *The Situation Ethics Debate,* ed., Harvey Cox, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.

Fletcher, Joseph. "Reflection And Reply" *The Situation Ethics Debate,* ed., Harvey Cox, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.

Fletcher, Joseph. *Situation Ethics.* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.

Gustafason, James M. *Theology and Christian Ethics.* Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1974.

Hartwell, Herbert. *The Theology Of Karl Barth,* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.

Koestler, Author. "The Predicament Of Man" *Alternatives To Violence,* ed. Larry Ng, New York: Time Life Books, 1968

Little, David. "Some Traditional Approaches To Moral Theory" *Military Chaplains' Review,* Washington, D.C., Department of Army, Winter, 1974.

Nelson, James B. "Contextualism And The Ethical Triad" *The Situation Ethics Debate,* ed. Harvey Cox, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.

Outkat, Gene. *Agape.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

Rolston, Holmes. *A Conservative Looks To Barth and Brunner.* Hahville: Cokesbury, 1933.

Ruether, Rosemar Radford. *The Radical Kingdom.* New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Seifert, Harvey, "The Promise and Peril of Contextualism" *The Situation Ethics Debate,* ed., Harvey Cox, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.

Thielicke, Helmut. *Theological Ethics, Vol 2.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

Weber, Theodore R. "Ethical Theory And Value Education" *Military Chaplains' Review,* Washington, D.C.: Department of Army, Winter, 1974.

---

[41]Hartwell, *The Theology of Karl Barth,* p. 163.

Validating Management As Ministry In The Army Chaplaincy

Chaplain (LTC) Don C. Breland

It is a fact of life in the military chaplaincy that a chaplain will eventually be "kicked upstairs" into a management role. The "up-or-out" promotion system will not allow a chaplain to remain at the lower ranks where he or she can conduct a primary ministry characterized by the classic clergy functions (preaching, counseling, etc.). He or she will be propelled into new dimensions of ministry, ready or not. For many chaplains this forced move into new functional roles creates a very real tension.

A recently promoted chaplain expressed this tension to me not long ago. He said, "I've been doing what I feel God called me to do—preaching, carrying on a good troop ministry, and so forth. But now I've been made a brigade chaplain. I'm a 'middle manager' with all of the administration and supervision that that involves. I don't have any training for this, and, besides, it just means that I have less and less time to do ministry." In another case, a chaplain whose job was basically administrative began a small Bible study group after duty hours just so he could feel engaged in some phase of ministry. Another administrative chaplain reported that at a recent denominational meeting he was almost apologetic for not being engaged in one of the more traditional modes of ministry. Indeed, he became aware that he spoke in very vague and imprecise terms in order to preclude his civilian colleagues from knowing the nature of his present work. His fear was that they would disapprove and feel that he had "left the ministry." The presence of such tension surrounding issues of supervision, administration, and leadership raises a very central question; namely,

Is Management Ministry?

Before this question can be addressed, some understanding of the term "management" must be delineated. In the literature on management and organizational functioning a wide range of definitions can be found.

Chaplain (LTC) Don C. Breland is currently the Director of the Institute for Creative Ministry at Fort Hood, Texas. He graduated from Dallas Theological Seminary and is a Full Supervisor in the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education.

Hersey and Blanchard observe, ". . . there are almost as many definitions of management as there are writers in the field." Then, based on a common thread which they observe in most definitions, they offer, "We shall define management as working with and through individuals and groups to accomplish organizational goals."[1] Admittedly, this is a broad definition which does not answer some of the specific questions which we might push against it. Other writers in the field go to great lengths to define both the role and functions of management.[2] In any case, it seems essential that every chaplain develop some personal, operational definition of management to be utilized in ministry. Lindgren and Shawchuck observe, "A pastor, then, in order to provide a balanced ministry to the congregation, must be as skillful in designing and managing effective organizations as he or she is in preaching, theologizing and counseling."[3]

We must also examine our theological presuppositions about management before we can answer questions about its place in our ministry. One of the most helpful approaches in this regard has been provided to us by John Calvin. He postulated that the pastor's functions in some measure parallel those of Christ, *i.e.,* Prophet, Priest, and King.[4] Each of these functions were seen by Calvin as having equal importance to the life of the church. Lindgren and Shawchuck summarize the three functions as follows:

> *Prophetic:* Calling the church to love and justice; challenging, discomforting, warning. Most clearly seen in the activity of preaching.
> *Priestly:* Calling the church to its highest possible spiritual state; consoling, comforting, accepting, forgiving. Most clearly seen in pastoral-sacramental activities (administering sacraments, counseling, and so forth).
> *Kingly:* Administering wisely and effectively the resources God has given the church. Most clearly seen in organizational activities (management, planning, training, and so forth).[5]

Robert Worley defines the "King" function as "wise rule" and "governance," and then concludes that, "Governance is an activity that is practical, concrete, and a profound expression of theological reflection."[6]

For various reasons, however, the Kingly function in ministry has been given a lower priority and value than the Prophetic and Priestly ones. This has been especially true in Protestantism, and largely remains so today. Worley concludes:

---

[1]Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard, *Management of Organizational Behavior* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 3.

[2]Chris Argyris, *Management and Organizational Development* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1971). Chris Argyris is a recognized authority in the field of management and organizational development. His book is selected as a reference because it relates management to the total life of an organization.

[3]Alvin J. Lindgren and Norman Shawchuck, *Management for Your Church* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1977) p. 16.

[4]John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* trans. John Allen, Book II, Chapter XV (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), pp. 540-50.

[5]Lindgren and Shawchuck, *Management for Your Church,* pp. 17, 18.

[6]Robert C. Worley, *A Gathering of Strangers* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), pp. 98, 99.

Cultural conditioning, theological education, and personal style and proclivities have combined to produce both ministers and lay persons with expectations which are theologically heretical. They envision a truncated ministry of Christ, done by professionals. In the meantime, the church languishes. Leaders quit or are dismissed. Structures are reorganized. New coalitions vote out the "rascals who produced the latest mess." The resources, energy, imagination, and life of members are sapped in efforts that are not the ministry of Christ's people.[7]

It becomes apparent, then, that "wise rule" is a key ingredient in the life and healthy functioning of the church. And along with the prophetic and priestly, it is absolutely essential to a balanced and unified understanding of ministry.

One other theological investigation (among the many which are relevant to this subject) seems crucial at this point. Ephesians (chapter four) makes it clear that God has given gifts and talents to His people and then has called these gifted people into His service. Further, these gifted people are assembled into the Body of Christ, with each member making his or her own unique contribution to the life and functioning of that Body. Now the question arises, "Who provides the 'wise rule,' the management, the organizing of these vast energies into some sort of harmonious whole?" Ultimately, of course, God through the Holy Spirit is the primary "King." But it is also apparent that God has chosen to work through His people and the management processes (or lack of) which they bring to the mission of the church. A quick review of the church's history reveals to even the casual observer that its management processes and structures have varied greatly from era to era. And although certain offices (Bishop, Elder, etc.) are established in the New Testament, many of the offices and organizations in today's church have been created by God's people in an effort to become more effective in pursuing the Great Commission. And the "wise rule" of all of this is absolutely essential.

So, we return to the question posed earlier, "Is Management Ministry?" The evidence seems to demand a definitely positive response. Indeed, we are led to ask the question, "Is ministry really ministry without management?" Worley concludes, "A role for clergy in teaching, assisting, equipping, organizing, supporting, and enabling leaders and members points to a higher doctrine of ministry, and one that is needed for both church and world."[8] Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber suggests, perhaps with just a little bias, "Management is, all things considered, the most creative of all arts. It is the art of arts, because it is the organizer of talent."[9]

The centrality and importance of management in ministry prompts us then, to ask:

---

[7] *Ibid*, p. 88.

[8] *Ibid*, p. 108.

[9] Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber as quoted in the Center for Parish Development, "Management for Ministry and Mission," Module 10, Topic 2, p. 2.

Do Chaplains Validate Management As Ministry?

The honest answer to this question is that there is no answer—at least not one that would accurately describe the perspective of every individual chaplain. However, there are some indicators of broad trends and generic issues which can be highlighted. Part of the information presented in this regard is derived from informal data gathering which I have done at the Army Chaplain School and at Fort Hood. The importance of these concerns merits further, more formal investigation. Other elements of information are taken from literature in the field, including Chaplain Kermit Johnson's comprehensive study of chaplain attitudes.[10]

There are several dynamics which influence and serve as background to chaplains' attitudes on management. In large measure, these dynamics are present for all clergy, military and civilian. Perhaps the most pervasive of these is the over-arching emphasis within the church on the Prophetic and Priestly at the expense of a truncated emphasis on the Kingly. Thus, those who become clergy select such roles. After all, there is an atmosphere of praise and value around those role models who exhibit the most noteworthy prophetic and priestly abilities. The presuppositions and norms which are developed around ministry in this atmosphere often do a great disservice to the Kingly role. Indeed, these norms may even create suspicion about the place of "wise rule" in the arena of ministry. Witness the comments at the opening of this paper which highlighted the tension which some chaplains experienced as they moved into the area of "wise rule." In a very real sense this is an unnecessary tension and one which saps energy away from a full and balanced ministry. The church really needs to re-evaluate those norms, values, and theological presuppositions which hinder wise rule from becoming equally important with the prophetic and priestly functions.

Many chaplains report that they had no specific instruction in seminary on management theory and no training to help them develop managerial skills. This absence of curriculum focus on governance concerns tended to reinforce the general de-emphasis of this role in the church. They thus entered ministry, for the most part, with little managerial competence other than that which they had absorbed by happenchance from a few significant role models in their lives. But even more serious was an inherited negative value system about management which tended to enervate any motivation to acquire managerial competencies.

Then when a chaplain enters active duty, he or she is most normally given an assignment which continues to emphasize the prophetic and priestly functions. While this is probably as it should be, it must be recognized that this produces little, if any, motivation to begin to value management and to develop skills in this area. This is reinforced by very

---

[10]Kermit Johnson, "Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction Among Army Chaplains," United States Army War College, 1976.

little training or emphasis on management being provided by the chaplaincy to entry-level chaplains.

The "honeymoon" doesn't last long, however. Before the young chaplain knows it, he or she is thrust into supervision and administration. In my own case, I had been a middle manager (Brigade Chaplain) twice before the end of my third year on active duty! With the help of some friends, a lot of prayer, and a little bit of intuition, things turned out all right. But I had no theory base, and only a vague theological one for what I was doing. A sizeable number of chaplains have allowed that their own experience was not vastly different.

Finally, chaplains have not been taught to think and pastor systemically. The prophetic and priestly functions of pastoring are characterized by individual efforts (preaching, counseling, administering the sacraments, etc.). This individualistic orientation is reinforced by the performance appraisal system of the Army (epitomized by the Officer Efficiency Report). A chaplain's career stands or falls on the basis of the accumulated evaluations of his or her individual personal and professional traits and abilities. It is therefore difficult (if not a little threatening) for a chaplain to give himself or herself fully to being the enabler of a system. But this is what the kingly role involves.

Cruden and Sherman define a system as, ". . . a set of coordinated components that work together to accomplish a common objective."[11] The chaplain who understands the church as a system can enable the individuals and sub-groups to become a whole which is much greater than the sum of its parts.

With these elements of background in focus, we move to look at some of the chaplain attitudes which were highlighted by Chaplain Johnson's survey. In his discussion of the results of his survey, he concludes:

> The two most satisfying roles for Army chaplains as a whole are the preacher and counselor roles, in that order. This has not changed since the author's Command and General Staff College research seven years ago. However, this does indicate to some extent the Protestant influence in the chaplaincy. Jewish chaplains rank religious educator or teacher first, representative of their denomination second, preacher third, staff officer and religious advisor to the commander fourth, and counselor fifth. Roman Catholics place liturgist-priest first, preacher second, representative of denomination third, religious educator or teacher fourth, and counselor fifth. Overall, the classic clergy roles appear to be most satisfying to chaplains, although a managerial role, supervisor of other chaplains, ranks sixth.[12] (See **Appendix A** for specific results.)

Further light is shed on these prioritizings if they are broken down by rank.[13] (See **Appendix B**.) The roles of "supervisor" and "administrator

---

[11]Hervert J. Cruden and Arthur W. Sherman, Jr., *Personnel Management* (Dallas: South-Western, 1972), p. 92.

[12]Johnson, p. 46.

[13]*Ibid*, pp. 27, 28.

and organizer" seem to fit most closely the concept of "wise rule." If the connecting of these two roles under the heading of "management" or "wise rule" is valid, then it can be seen that this combination is prioritized quite low by captains. It fairs increasingly better the higher the rank. But it never supercedes prophetic and priestly function, even at the rank of colonel where the primary role is most often a managerial one.[14]

An analysis of the dynamics which result in the prioritizations discussed above would be most interesting and informative. It is not within the scope of this paper to perform this analysis, however. Suffice it to say at this point that these dynamics are at least personal, theological, denominational, and institutional. They are pervasive in nature and directly affect the level of validation and incorporation of the kingly function into ministry.

Conclusion

This paper has addressed the question, "Is Management Ministry?" Investigations into both theological resources and organizational theory served as the components for building the answer. Management, or "wise rule," was found to be one of the three necessary elements for a full and balanced ministry. From the organizational and systems point of view, the manager is seen to be the essential enabler of the dynamic interrelatedness of any system as it moves to accomplish its objectives.

The attitudes of chaplains relating to their kingly role were described against the backdrop of their personal and theological heritage. Based on Chaplain Kermit Johnson's study, chaplains rank the role of "wise rule" sixth out of a list of sixteen possible choices. I postulated that this ranking would have been lower overall if "administrator and organizer" were included in it. When analyzed by rank, it was pointed out that the higher the rank of the chaplian, the higher he tended to value the "wise rule" demension of ministry. These facts do not make it clear, however, whether or not there is a genuine, personal validation of "wise rule" as being the third, co-equal component of ministry. It could be, for example, that the upper ranks prioritize "wise rule" high because that is a realistic reflection of the institutional expectations of them by the Army. Or it could be for a multitude of other reasons. The most accurate answer awaits further investigation.

The implications of all the concerns and issues which are raised in this paper are vast indeed. But one implication seems paramount at this juncture. Since the church, including the chaplaincy, could so obviously benefit from nurturing the kingly role into its rightful place in ministry, we need to be about that nurturing.

---

[14] *Ibid*, p. 28.

(From the following sixteen possible *roles* for Army Chaplains, indicate the degree of satisfaction you would derive from service in each role, by again marking on the answer sheet any number from 1 through 9, ranging from 1 as extremely dissatisfying through 9 as extremely satisfying.)

Ranking   **Average**

1.	Preacher	7.28
2.	Counselor	7.00
3.	Visitor of troops and families	6.34
4.	Representative of your denomination or church	6.19
5.	Liturgist or priest: baptism, circumcision, marriage, communion, mass, funerals, etc.	6.16
6.	Supervisor of other chaplains	6.02
7.	Religious educator or teacher	5.98
8.	Staff officer and religious advisor to the commander	6.65
9.	Morals and morale builder	5.19
10.	Evangelist-missionary	5.19
11.	Administrator and organizer	5.00
12.	Civilian community relations liaison	4.95
13.	Leader in social action: race relations, community affairs, etc.	4.82
14.	Personal Effectiveness Training Instructor	4.71
15.	Human Self-Development Instructor	4.24
16.	Organization Development Specialist	4.07

(For comparison purposes, research was done by the author at the US Army Command and General Staff College in 1969 on "A Study of Various Roles.")

Roles Prioritized By Denomination, 1976 Survey

Jewish	Protestant	Roman Catholic
Rel Educ	Preacher	Liturgist-Priest
Denom Rep	Counselor	Preacher
Preacher	Visitor	Denom Rep
Staff Off—Advisor	Supervisor	Rel Educ
Counselor	Denom Rep	Counselor
Liturgist-Priest	Liturgist-priest	Visitor
Admin-Org	Rel Educ	Morals-Morale
Supervisor	Staff Off—Advisor	Staff Off—Advisor
Morals-Morale	Evang-Miss	Social Action
Visitor	Admin-Org	Supervisor
Social Action	Morals-Morale	Civ Comm Liaison
PET	Civ Comm Liaison	Evang-Miss
Civ Comm Liaison	PET	Admin-Org
OD	Social Action	HSD
HSD	HSD	PET
Evang-Miss	OD	OD

The numerical ranking involves those roles chaplains consider to be the most important.

1. Preacher
2. Counselor
3. Liturgist-Priest
4. Religious Educator and Teacher
5. Staff Officer and Religious Advisor to the Commander
6. Representative of His Denomination or Church
7. Visitor
8. Evangelist-Missionary
9. Administrator and Organizer
10. Morals and Morale Builder
11. Character Guidance Instructor
12. Interpreter of Military Values
13. Leader in Social Action
14. Civilian Community Relations Specialist

Appendix B

Roles Prioritized by Rank, 1976 Survey

Captain	Mjaor	Lieutenant Colonel	Colonel
Preacher	Preacher	Preacher	Preacher
Counselor	Counselor	Counselor	Supervisor
Visitor	Visitor	Supervisor	Visitor
Denom Rep	Liturgist-Priest	Liturgist-Priest	Liturgist-Priest
Rel Educ	Denom Rep	Denom Rep	Counselor
Liturgist-Priest	Supervisor	Visitor	Rel Educ
Morals/Morale	Rel Educ	Staff Off/Adv	Denom Rep
Supervisor	Staff Off/Adv	Rel Educ	Staff Off/Adv
Evang/Miss	Evang/Miss	Social Action	Admin& Org
Staff Off/Adv	Civ Comm	Admin & Org	Evang/Miss
PET Instructor	Morals/Morale	Evang/Miss	Morals/Morale
Admin& Org	Admin & Org	Civ Comm Liaison	Social Action
Civ Comm Liaison	Social Action	Morals/Morale	Civ Comm Liais
Social Action	PET Instructor	PET Instructor	Human Self Dev
Human Self Dev	Human Self Dev	Org Dev Spec	PET Instructor
Organ Dev Spec	Org Dev Spec	Human Self Dev	Organ Dev Spec

Sanctuary, Privileged Communication and the Law

Chaplain (LTC) Phil White

In speaking of sanctuary and privileged communication one is tempted to do so within the context of a religious frame of reference. This is proper, since both are concepts arising from awakened religious sensibilities, the ultimate etiology of which may be, more or less, discoverable through diligent scholarly research.

By *sanctuary* I mean the concept of personal or territorial neutrality wherein a fugitive can find safety through exemption from the legal and physical forces of state or private agencies. Sanctuary has traditionally been provided for in every society, though in widely varied ways, either in the form of Mana (a positive value to be sought) or by Tabu (a negative value to be avoided). For example, the Plains Indians recognized exemption from the routine tribal laws for an insane person, whereas certain other tribes recognized as a Shaman (spiritual leader, or witch doctor) one exhibiting the same characteristics. Each society has its sanctuaries. I will resist the temptation to speak of the sanctuaries of alcoholic consumption as those relate to civil and pecuniary liability in drunken driving cases.

The point is that sanctuary is a sociological phenomenon widely observable and at least partially understood as to its functionality. That it has been closely associated with religion is not surprising.

But the second point is that is has been recognized, sometimes formally and at others informally, by the state as a legitimate sociological function. Indeed, it has been legitimized and ritualized, codified, and institutionalized in both oriental and western societies almost without exception. The law of the land either prescribes it or allows for it. It has seldom proscribed it, or even seriously attempted to regulate or control it.

Law has never ignored it. Our laws functionally recognize sanctuary on several levels, though we do not enjoy the kind of clear-cut tradition or code which some more homogenous societies have evolved. In the United States there is a proliferation of highly complex, rapidly evolving, and

Chaplain White, a Southern Baptist, is currently assigned to the faculty of the United States Army Chaplain Center and School, Fort Wadsworth, New York. He holds S.T.M. and D. Min. degrees from Andover Newton Theological School, where he studied Organizational Systems.

manifestly varied traditions and codes which come into play in any given arena to confuse the issue and deceive a casual observer.

It is against this kind of tapestry that one begins to view the whole question of the fragile but virile relationship between religion and civil government, between tradition and law, and between code and practice. Nothing is ever quite clear; nothing is static; nothing is simple.

Privileged communication is a fluid concept which has many layers of meaning. It is a religious value, and as such enjoys a rich and exciting history. It is a challenging, complex subject having to do with religious conscience, religious consciousness, ecclesiastical law, tradition, common assumptions, and a lot of other things. Everyone has a notion about it; nobody seems very clear in a description of it. It is at best vague, illusive, and ill-defined. It evokes all sorts of emotional responses when it is probed or challenged.

Privileged communication is an extension of sanctuary. It is a concept of safety or freedom from the civil or physical force of the state or private parties. But it is limited. It is restricted. It is *conditional.*

Some questions are raised. Is privileged communication a human right? Is it inalienable? Is it a matter of private, human right, or is it an exercise of religious freedom? Is it for everyone everywhere, or for some sometimes? Who is to determine it? Is it a privilege the state extends to groups, to individuals, or to society as a whole, or is it something society holds quite apart from the blessings of the state, something of another genre, which the state can neither give nor withhold?

What, in short, is its genre?

What is its nature?

What is its function?

Finally, how can it be recognized and identified, so that it can be described in such a way that two or more persons—indeed a society—can commonly agree concerning its place in society?

This leads to a most practical question: that of the legal position. That is, what does the civil code have to say about privileged communication, and what informs the civil mind in the formation of its utterance?

In general, civil law has evaded the issue, leaving most of the questions masked or unanswered at best. This is not by accident but by deliberate decision. The wisdom of it is revealed by the farcical nature of those exceptions where courts have been forced to make decisions, but generally enjoined from writing the rationale for those decisions.

The bottom line of the history of civil cases in the United States is that this is an area essentially not addressed, and one which, when addressed by the courts, leaves much to be desired. One wonders whether it is functionally possible for the state to decide an issue which is essentially a matter of religious sensibility, even though it surely has legal implications which cannot forever be evaded. One feels however, that any attempt at a legal resolution to such an issue must be informed by a critical understanding of the sociological (religious and psychological) dynamics at

work, which demand some sort of functional sanctuary for society, in order to maintain its social health.

Observers of the social scene soon discover that most social phenomena do not happen accidentally; surely those which persist do so because they serve some teleological function. In the case of sanctuary, and specifically in the case of privileged communication, such function may be described as providing an avenue of approach toward the goal of personal (and social) safety, which is essential to human survival.

Not every social or private ill has a readily available cure. Access to God, or to those who stand in God's place (vicar) is an essential function of religion. Religion is accepted almost universally as essential to society. Therefore, society accepts, encourages, and embraces those religious values and practices which provide for release from guilt, give meaning to otherwise senseless human conditions, and stabilize the flow of social energies into avenues perceived to be productive.

Privileged communication is of this sort of genre. It is an exercise of that deepest part of the human experience which is common to all persons and finds expression in observable behavior through acts (rituals, rites, practices) generally evolved through the collective social-religious experience. There may be other avenues of approach, but this is one example of such a phenomenon which has become codified and institutionalized by some (the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical code) and widely recognized and practiced by many others. The point is that it is a legitimate and essential sociological phenomenon which has evolved from human social need, and formed expression through religious practice. That it has been recognized and honored by the state is not accidental or incidental.

The nature of privileged communication is confessional. This presupposes certain kinds of conditions, but must not allow for restrictive interpretation of a mechanical or even of a legal sort to constrict and coerce the essence of the condition into a mold which would destroy it. When one speaks of confession, the word itself evokes images of meanings of one particular sort or another. In a pluralistic society like ours, where there is not the slightest possibility of total agreement around the question of a "standard" or "authorized" religious practice, one must apply a universalist rather than a particularist rule of approach.

The tendency to universalize the issue out of existence is always present, with its counter tendency, that of demanding such a particularistic view as to deny the issue entirely. Hence the general position of both clerics and legalists to assume certain positions without ever challenging them or defining them to the satisfaction of a public.

The nature of privileged communication as a possibility in a free society, then, becomes a universal question. But its application can be made only in highly individual, particularistic ways. There is no problem for theorists or pragmatists around the broader ideal; there are many problems around any particular incident which can be constructed. Both history and theoretical constructs easily bear this out.

In relating privileged communication to the confessional, all other entities aside, one is left with an irreducible entity which may be called a *relationship*. This relationship is traditionally understood in terms of roles (priest and pentitent) and functions (repentance and absolution, etc.) specified by roles. It is also understood generally within a time-space configuration (inside a confessional booth, after the fact of some sin or sins, usually thought to be acts). That this is not an adequate description of the confessional obviates the conclusion that this kind of restrictive, definitive description is not adequate to comprehend or express that irreducible element of privileged communication.

Since it is not adequate, if one is to find an adequate approach, how is it to be done? Who is qualified to do it? What are those qualifying standards? What constrains one to address the question?

Some general statements concerning privileged communication follow:

1. Privileged communication assumes a *unique relationship* between an individual and another. The nature of that relationship is, at its barest level, one which is so fully human as to defy restriction on the basis of any particular idea, value or practice of any religious, civil or ecclesiastical entity whatever. It is a functional relationship which is essential to the most basic social expression of the most fundamental of all human need, that of religion. To deny, restrict, or prescribe this in any way would do violence to basic human, inalienable right. It would be to deprive a person of humanity itself. It is in the context of this relationship that an individual expresses the deepest existential, theological and cosmic concerns of his life, not in the secrecy and safety of his own being, but essentially and necessarily, with another.

2. This *relationship* is a *condition*, not only a function. As such it is not simply an act, which may be optional, or which may have alternatives of equal merit. As a condition, it is to beg the question to ask whether it is desirable, appropriate, or optional. To deny it is not to change it, but to deny reason itself.

3. As a conditional relationship, it follows that volition and deliberate intent are not necessarily essential to the relationship, although it is surely the case that these are possible and desirable. Voliltion is not requisite to privileged communication.

4. Since volition is not essential to the existence of privileged communication it follows that the question of time-space is not germane.

5. Content or the nature of the communicated thing in itself is commonly thought of as constituting an essential element or condition of privileged communication. This can not be the case, else the term "privileged" should come to mean "restricted" and the freedom it is designed to promote should become entrapment or ensnarement instead. The nature of the communicated thing in itself is of only secondary importance to that which is of the essence, namely the *condition* of the communicator. It is not what the communicator says, or even why he says it

that matters; it is, rather, that the *condition* exists in which it may be said — freely and without either constriction or restraint. It is the *condition* of vulnerability that cries out for relief. Privileged communication can offer relief to that condition only when it is absolutely free—only when sanctuary is unconditional. This is the meaning of grace, (unconditional and unmerited) or it has no meaning.

6. It follows then, that no person can approach the question of legal definition with license, though it is well recognized that there are those minds which cannot rest easy alongside unconstrained freedom. To these minds a word of caution: to embody spirit is to destroy both spirit and flesh.

Some pragmatic considerations are suggested:

1. The construction of the cosmos is not perfect in every facet of its reality. There may be (accidental) occasions in which just and wise men may feel the need to define or otherwise describe the essence of privileged communication, as an exercise of judgment around some social interchange or another. This being the case, there may be those who will conclude from such an accident that society must construct safeguards to forever prevent such accidents from recurring.

To this I say that such an effort, though noble, is doomed by its very nature to failure. Should it be possible to codify and thus prescribe every act of man, much less every sentiment, it would be none the more desirable to do so. The entire history of law (certainly that of *the* Law) should teach us this. It is not accidental that civil courts as well as clerics have wisely stepped around such temptations in the past.

2. In applying wise and prudent judgment to those accidental cases wherein some disposition seems to be demanded, one must ask some fairly elementary questions:

a. Whose rights are being protected, the communicant's, the reciever's, society's, all of these—whose?

b. Is privileged communication a right or a privilege? Is it a basic human right which both the religious (moral) and legal entities of society recognize, or is it a privilege granted by either the state or the church to certain ones who in some way "qualify"?

c. What part (if any) does volition, intent, rational selectivity, intelligence, health, sanity, duress, etc. play determining the condition or relationship, or the functional validity of privileged communication?

d. Can privileged communication exist—take place, happen—even if neither of the parties *knows it?* Can it *not* take place if both believe that it has? What if only *one* believes so? *Which* one? Why?

e. Is it possible for either or both parties in a privileged communication situation to be accountable to a third party for the legitimacy or the functional efficacy of that relationship and condition?

f. What is the *basis* for the answers to any or all of these questions? Are the answers informed by a world view? A religious idea? A social consciousness? A philosophy of legal codes? A concept of common

law? Legal precedence? Really? How can one be certain? What is at stake if one is in error on any of these?

3. In utilizing certain terms such as "clergy," "penitent," "religion," "society," "confession," "essential," etc., we must be careful never to assume that the religious community and the legal community assume a common language or a common experience. For the most part, it is no more safe to assume that lawyers can agree among themselves about these issues than that clergy can do so. Evidence is heavy that we cannot agree. Is it really necessary that we should? Why?

4. Is it not possible that the elusive element of this entire question is wrapped up in the mysterious nature of our own being? Perhaps the best we can do is to recognize the validity of mystery, affirm its role in life, and ascribe this area to that domain. This would not solve the problem, but it might position it in a more legitimate way than if we weaken or destroy a reality, which, though undefined, has played an important role in society.

5. Should someone persist in following the path of inquiry, in an effort to "pin it down," these last questions must be asked:

a. Is this a *religious* matter, into which the state should delve only in extreme cases, if at all?

b. Is it a *legal* matter? If so, *what* should inform the legal mind as it addresses this legal matter?

c. To what extent, if any, must we see this as a sociological question which may affect the very essence of our existence?

d. How faithfully must our speaking about privileged communication fit the phenomenal facts without doing violence to both the concept and the phenomena?

6. Finally, the question of how to address this subject from a doctrinal point of view for the purpose of teaching chaplains and chapel activities specialists must be addressed.

There are many different beliefs among chaplains about this question. That there is no common understanding about it seems to obviate the need for instruction. On the other hand, should instruction take place, there is a need for common understanding to occur, at least among chaplains in key leadership positions (if not among top leaders at DA level) to include various disciplines.

My own contention is that privileged communication is a social requirement deriving from the religious nature of man's being—his need to have available an avenue of safety through which to pass in his quest for survival and human dignity. If it is this, it cannot stand a proscriptive or a prescriptive legal definition more precise than those embodied in the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Further, since it is a psycho-sociological need as well as a religious interest, it must not take on the pattern, shape, or image of any particular religious rite or it will lose in its specificity what it most inherently demands: universality.

As it is now interpreted by most American clergy with whom I have

spoken, it vacillates between some generalized assumptions around a concept of "common law" and the more specific Roman Catholic model of prescribed confessional, neither of which is acceptable to large segments of the population; the first is too vague and is a myth, while the latter is far too limited and exclusive.

To raise the question endangers the public interest, because the only social force which has entertained the issue on behalf of the public has been civil courts, which may not be informed as to the true nature of the proposition, and, in their lack of understanding tend either toward the particularistic religious model available or to silence for lack of a better model.

Ideally, those segments of the broader community which stand to be most directly and immediately affected by a resolution of the question should assume the task of explorative dialog in a responsible way. Short of that, the courts may, by default, inherit an unwelcome offspring of a distant relative and not know quite what to do about it. That they have done very little so far speaks to their wisdom in the past.

Similarly, legislative bodies are particularly inept at sorting out these kinds of issues, choosing for the most part to ignore them or to be happily unaware of them.

Only the educational segments of our society are adequately equipped to accomplish the task. But individual clergy, and others in helping professions who daily lay their practice on the line, can reasonably be expected to view the subject as one worthy of struggle toward intentional resolution.

Peer-Help Alternatives for Organizational Helpers

Chaplain (CPT) Frank D. Richardson, Ph. D.

Helping and Organizational Constraints

For the past decade, greater social concern and government pressure for equal opportunity employment have fostered rapid growth in the human-services staff functions of complex organizations. There has been an ever-increasing "tail-to-teeth" ratio of offices devoted to human services as compared to line production, development and delivery functions. Now, in an era of crunching economics, the trend is reversing. Organizations are beginning to "skinny down" their non-operational functions. Delivering needed human services at minimum cost, while deferring to priority organizational objectives, is the *sine qua non* of modern organizational helping efforts.

When I speak of helpers I am talking about the professional social workers, counselors, psychologists, chaplains and employee relations specialists who handle the "people problems" of complex organizations. A chat with any of these will likely reveal the level to which the conflict between human needs and organizational imperatives has been driven by austere budgets and eroding resources. The organizational helper is trapped at the grinding point between increasing demand for services and tightening organizational constraints.

The military chaplain fits very easily into the common picture of organizational helpers. The similarities in organizational helping environments should be easily recognizable to chaplains, and a discussion of their impact on helping efforts can be instructive for the chaplain who is struggling to understand the forces which influence helping effectiveness.

Helping Liabilities

In the process of making our helping efforts more effective, organizational helpers are struggling to resolve some tough issues. Basically, the organizational helper must be able to answer the question: "Am I free to help in my organizational environment?"

Chaplain Richardson is a MOBDES staff member of the U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School. He holds a Ph.D. (University of Washington, 1974), and is currently employed in a training and evaluation position with the LDS Church, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Defining the nature of that help could consume too much space for a discussion like this. When I speak of help and helping, I refer to a concept of help such as that described by Brammer, "helping other people grow toward their personal goals and to strengthen their capacities to cope with life."[1]

The emphasis in individual counseling and therapy relationships outside organizations is upon personal growth and improved coping. By contrast, many calls for help to which the organizational helper must respond focus primarily upon manipulation of the organization or environment. Essentially, the question is not whether the helper is *capable* of helping, but whether the conflicts and paradoxes of organizational helping roles leave the helper *free to help*.

Analysis of organizational helping roles suggests three considerations which seem to determine a helper's freedom to be helpful.

Role Expectations. The organizational helper commonly does not operate independently. The helper answers to someone. It may be a chief of social work, a counseling supervisor, or a director of personnel relations. The chaplain is generally linked to a chaplain supervisor who provides technical direction.

In addition to this line of technical supervision, the organizational helper probably has to follow a job description, operating procedures, organizational policies regarding referral, absence from job locations to seek help, reporting, and so on. These constraints or directives, whether informal or written, form a body of *organizational role expectations*. The helper has to comply with them in order to perform satisfactorily for the employer. Such expectations may change slightly when a new boss comes on board. Shifts in organizational policy may change them gradually. Yet, they likely remain a constant, and rather easily defined factor in the helping environment.

Each client brings to the helping relationship another set of expectations about what a person in a helping role should be able to do or say. *Client role expectations* tend to be extremely variable. They range from the hope that the helper will be a good listener, to the demand that the helper fling him or herself into the client's fray with the organizational power structure.

It is not unusual for persons seeking help in organizations to view themselves as patients, the only role in which they have ever received professional help. These clients bring to the relationship all the expectations belonging to the medical/psychoanalytical model of help. Other clients say they don't know what to expect. They just want help.

Unlike organizational role expectations, those brought by the client are normally open to some negotiation. The helper has the opportunity to surface and clarify them with the client.

A third set of expectations belongs to the helper. It is difficult to

---

[1]Brammer, L.M. *The Helping Process.* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), p. 1.

generalize about such expectations. They vary greatly. They may be difficult to define or verbalize. In organizational settings, these *personal role expectations* are likely to be flexible and dependent upon some combination of the organizational and client expectations described above. If they were not, the helper would be caught between conflicting organizational and client expectations and must either become immobilized or alientated from the client or the organization, or both.

Role Conflicts. It is not uncommon for helpers to occupy more than one position in the organization. The social worker may also sit on the agency budget committee; the school counselor may also teach or coach; the organizational psychologist may also sit on a personnel policy council. The chaplain's role-dualism as pastor and staff officer is not unique among organizational helpers.

Even when organizational loyalties are not divided between positions, a helping role may incorporate functions which are not fully compatible. For example, the social case worker whose job is to help clients become self-sustaining also holds the strings to the purse which keeps the client coming back for help. For the military chaplain, there is the problem of being the brother's keeper: "Keep him happy, but keep him in the service." Solving too many problems by discharging clients is not, by definition, effective helping. Where these conflicting role functions exist, the helper may experience conflicting motives and may be faced with the apparent necessity of hiding true motives from the client.

Role Contamination. One characteristic or organizational helping roles which makes them different from helping roles outside organizations is the consequence of the helper's position in the power structure. With few exceptions, the organizational helper *is somebody* in the organization. The helper's advanced training enhances his or her influence among levels of leadership. This influence or position power enables the helper, when necessary, to put pressure on the organization in the client's behalf. This power lever is a great advantage in the pragmatics of organizational helping. It may also be a significant disadvantage in the helping relationship itself.

The position power possessed by the helper tends to contaminate the helping process. When the helper is in a position of power, questions of *motives* exist for both helper and client. "What does this client really want from me," asks the helper. The client is wondering, at the same time, whether the helper can be counted on to take risks for the client's well-being, or whether the helper is just an organizational stooge trying to look good.

The position power possessed by the helper also hinders in *assessing helping outcomes.* Will the client feel free to discuss negative outcomes or failures in the helping process with a person who is tied closely to organizational leadership? Would the client feel free, for example, to respond honestly with: "No, I don't think I'd be willing to try that," or "No,

I haven't been able to stop taking drugs." Chances are good that many clients, out of fear or deference for the position of the helper in the organization will be inclined to mask negative feelings and report only positive outcomes.

The power variable further contaminates the helping process by accentuating in a rather unpredictable fashion the phenomena of *dependence* and *resistance*. Most chaplains have had frequent experiences with persons who see the helper as their salvation within the organization, a wall of defense against perceived organizational injustice, or a sympathetic crutch for beating off charges of poor performance. The next client may be one who resents being referred, who perceives no need for help, who views counseling as interrogation, and is suspicious of anyone who wields organizational power.

Each of the considerations discussed above impacts upon, and makes more complex, the already delicate helping process. Successful helping in an organizational setting may require extreme flexibility. As most helpers already know, unresolvable conflicts will arise. The same role benefits which give the helper necessary clout are likely to be his or her greatest liabilities in the helping process. My observations of helpers in organizational settings has caused me to conclude that many helpers operate in environments where they are so bound by organizational constraints, expectations and role difficulties that they are not truly free to enter into helping relationships with those who seek their help.

Peer Help as an Alternative

Considering the liabilities to the helping process in organizational helping roles leads one to conclude that alternatives must be explored. One alternative, which seems to have much promise, is mobilizing non-professional peer-help capabilities in an organization.

The popular press provides many models for peer-help programs. Alcoholics Anonymous, various church-related programs, drug, weight-control and cooperative parenting groups are all peer-help examples of attempts to maximize and distribute helping resources within groups or interest areas where a sense of community exists. Because a true sense of community seldom exists in complex organizations, few peer-help models adaptable to organizational environments are discussed in current literature. Examples of peer-help programs in complex organizations have usually been limited to schools, hospitals and other treatment institutions where the clients are students, patients or inmates, and where professional services flow from permanent staff to temporary residents.[2]

Examples of peer-help possibilities in military organizations might include: pairing of a client whose personal life keeps interrupting duty

[2]See Slack, C.W. and Slack, E.N. "It takes Three to Break a Habit," *Psychology Today,* 9(February, 1976), pp. 46-50f; and Allen, E.E. "Para-professionals in a Large-scale University Program," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 53 (December, 1974), pp.276-280.

performance with a peer who manages a healthy separation between personal and duty matters; or pairing a client who can't make a decision with a peer who has recently crossed the same hurdle. Other possibilities include peer-assistance in drug, alcohol, military education, rehabilitation, family relations, physical fitness and performance improvement programs. The military chaplaincy presents many professional challenges to which peer-help alternatives are suitable. The chapel activities specialist, parish members and unit peers are all logical resources upon which the chaplain might draw for peer-help assistance.

One Peer-help Approach. In struggling with the requirement to provide more effective help to young U.S. Army couples experiencing troubled marriage relationships, the author and a colleague, Dr. David Island, elected to use a peer-help model. These peer helpers had to be young couples whose marriages had the earmarks of growth and a maturing stability, who could be trained to help. They would be fully free to do so outside the normal organizational constraints under which professional helpers operate.

Family relationships lie clearly outside the boundaries of many organizational settings. This is not the case with the military, where the organization assumes partial responsibility for all aspects of an individual's life.

As we designed this peer-help program to assist young couples, a primary goal was to build a framework of helping principles which might transfer easily to other organizational settings.

The Home Assistance Training (HAT) program is a peer-help supplement to professional organizational helping endeavors focused on young troubled families. Potential helping couples were interviewed to give us an idea of their attitudes, energy, awareness and interpersonal competencies.[3] During the interviews we attempted to pin our judgments to observable behaviors.

The training portion of the program[4] featured two day-long workshops and a series of "support team" meetings at two-week intervals where the couples met to learn from their own and others' helping experiences. The couples were then introduced to other young families who were experiencing troubled relationships. The helping (HAT) couples were closely supervised by the social worker or chaplain who introduced the couples.

HAT couples were told that we had few expectations about their performance. We explained that we did not expect them to work as

---

[3]Brown contrasts selection criteria for professionals and para-professionals in Brown, W.F. "Effectiveness of Para-professionals: The Evidence," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 53 (December, 1974), pp. 261-262.

[4]Training was designed to integrate awareness, skills and competencies, and followed a model introduced by: Richardson, F.D. & Island, D. "A Model for Training Workshops and Labs," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 53(April, 1975) pp. 592-597.

amateur psychiatrists, and that their goal was not necessarily to change the troubled couples—simply to respond as fully and deeply as they were able.

Peer-help Principles and Their Implications

Analysis of the organizational peer-help program just described led to the formultation of a set of tentative peer-help principles which may account for the successful initial outcomes of this largely unexplored helping resource.

Principle one. Together, peer-helper and peer draw upon the positive characteristics of an already existing relationship.

Implications. The helping relationship has the benefit of past history. Trust has, as its basis, extended behavioral observation, as opposed to self-report. This means that questions of helping motives are more easily resolved. In addition, the response time required for the helping process to begin yielding helping results is shorter. Help occurs more rapidly because acquaintance, knowing and trusting steps (interpersonal exploration) have already been partially completed.

Principle two. Because peer-helper and peer share roles and are equal in status, they are free to devote energies to coping, rather than working through power, dependence and other issues related to organizational status.

Implications. Peer-helper and peer are dependent upon the helping relationship rather than upon the helper's training or organizational position power. What the helper does for the peer today, the peer may do for the helper tomorrow. Both will have the sense that what they do for each other is meeting their own needs. The tendency for helper and client to conspire together to deceive one another about the degree to which help has occurred is alleviated.

Principle three. Peer-helper and peer are mutually aware that both will be changed by their helping relationship.

Implications. By inviting help in coping with life situations, the peer assumes some responsibility for the effects of his or her behavior upon the helper. They share a sense of interdependence, realizing that the outcomes of the relationship will impact upon both of them. The peer assumes some responsibility for creating the conditions under which the helper is asked to help. The peer recognizes her or his role in encouraging the helper to persist and offers interpersonal rewards, thereby certifying the peer's receptiveness. Helping efforts reflect concern for the future history of the relationship and, therefore, tend to increase trust level.

Principle four. The capacity to help is seen as developmental and learned rather than role-specific or the outcome of formal training.

Implications. A helper may acquire helping skills without professional training, and will continue to learn by doing. A helper is an

enabler—one who enables another to grow toward desired goals or cope with life situations more adequately. The problem of guilt and self-doubt arising from not feeling helped by one who has been trained to help is avoided. "Gee, I must be bad off. Even the shrink couldn't help me." Viewing helping roles in this manner greatly expands the range of helping resources available to organizations. The task becomes one of identifying and involving helpers, rather than hiring or training helpers.

It has to be noted that the advantages of a peer-help relationship, as outlined here, can ideally be expected when any professional helper enters into a helping relationship. In a nonprofessional peer-help relationship these outcomes can occur more quickly, however. There is less expenditure of energy in overcoming organizational constraints. Helping efforts are building blocks in what tends to be more durable helping relationships. Peer-help relationships are not initiated abruptly, nor are they suddenly terminated for lack of time or because of other demands upon the helper.

Overcoming Limitations of Peer-help Efforts

Advantages of peer-help alternatives are offset somewhat by obvious and important disadvantages. It may be that peer-helpers will lack the degree of *self-awareness* and *recognition of their own helping needs* which are ideally among the professional helper's greatest assets. While these considerations could pose serious limitations to the helping relationship, the tendency to overcome deficiencies by increased formal training offsets the advantages which were sought in utilizing peer-help alternatives in the first place. Increased training alters peer-helpers' personal role expectations. It may, at least initially, divert attention from responding freely and deeply to those in need and focus attention on employing techniques and skills which are only incidental to the helping process. In the HAT program described earlier, we explored two alternative strategies which, over time, would enable the peer-helpers to improve their skills without introducing role conflicts.

One strategy was the *helping team*. The team consists of two or more peer-helpers who have a common understanding of their role and can give one another focused feedback. Thus, husband and wife, or helper and partner, help each other persist in practicing helping skills and to increase personal awareness in helping functions.

The other strategy employed a *support team*. The support team creates a supportive environment for learning from helping experiences. Comprised of several helping teams, the support team shares insights, re-emphasizes goals and practices skills. Members provide one another with feedback on performance and application of skills. They may also attempt to explore, under supervision, the difficult areas of helping needs, awareness, dependence and other issues related to possible deficiencies in the peer-help model.

While it is very early to reach conclusions about the potential of peer-help alternatives in complex organizations, the area deserves im-

mediate and resourceful exploration. Professional helpers can function as peer-help facilitators and resource persons. Under their supervision, volunteer helpers may greatly extend the reach of organizational helping efforts. Using this tool, chaplains can provide more effective ministries. They will increase the number of helping situations in which both helper and client grow and cope more adequately with life as a result of the helping encounter.

Additional References

Gibb, J.R. "Is Help Helpful?" Obtainable from the Association Forum and Section Journals of the Association of Secretaries of the YMCA: Personnel Services, National Council of YMCA's, 291 Broadway, New York, New York, 10007.

Rogers, C.R. "The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship." In *On Becoming a Person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961, pp. 39-58.

Marriage Preparation Course: Marital Sexuality

Major James R. David, ACSW, and Susan David, RN

The continuing decline in the number of marriages that remain intact until the death of one of the partners is a matter of concern for many Americans. Training courses and therapeutic groups that address communication skills and other routes to interpersonal fulfillment after marriage seem to enroll only a fraction of the population and to attract those who are least in need. Establishing effective, "preventive maintenance" programs for marriage preparation constitutes a preferable alternative than reacting to later marital discord with marital therapy.

Marriage preparation courses are as variable as the locales in which they occur. Most common is the informal information exchange among friends which may simply perpetuate myths and supposed cultural values. Ofttimes damaging stereotypes regarding sex roles are transmitted, for example: "Men work outside the house, women do the inside work" or "Men are logical, women are emotional."

On the other hand a marriage preparation course might include an "Engaged Encounter Weekend," created by the Worldwide Marriage Encounter movement. This is a sophisticated, comprehensive program which enables an engaged couple to share in depth their feelings, thoughts, and values on every conceivable aspect of married life. The weekend is facilitated by two couples and a clergyperson who share their own life experiences as catalysts for greater openness between the engaged men and women. Unfortunately, this weekend approach is not widely available, presumably because it requires so much in time, financial resources, and people efforts.

Another approach, which can be as effective as an Engaged Encounter Weekend, but is easier to implement for the target population, is "The Couple Sponsor Program." This was also initiated by Worldwide Marriage Encounter. Quite simply, each engaged couple is assigned to a married couple who invites them into their home for a minimum of four

evenings to discuss and intimately share every conceivable area of married life. A detailed outline is followed. The major and obvious difficulty with this method is in locating and training a sufficient number of married couples who are willing to be open and self-disclosing regarding their own marriages.

A fourth method is the traditional screening or counseling sessions held between the clergyperson, who will officiate at the marriage, and the engaged couple. Success is largely dependent upon the ability of the clergyperson to re-energize himself or herself and re-activate enthusiasm for what can become a very routine, dull, impersonal task.

The following addresses one aspect of another method of preparing couples for marriage. This method—and there are undoubtedly many others not mentioned here—is the widely used "course" approach wherein the couple attends a series of lectures or group discussions led by experts in law, finance, medicine, etc. An apparent shortcoming in this method is the absence of ongoing, personal contact between the teachers and pupils. Nevertheless, we are enthusiastic about our experience in presenting the marital sexuality portion of the Fort Gordon, Georgia, Marriage Preparation Course.

Recognized Need

The course has a Judeo-Christian, interdenominational orientation and is sponsored by the Office of the Post Chaplain. There had been a widely recognized need to reach the increasingly large number of active duty soldiers who were marrying; Fort Gordon, with a troop population of 17,000 desperately needed a program.

Earlier efforts had been accomplished within each denomination with mixed results. Establishing a centralized, interdenominational program reduced the individual workload of the clergy while providing specialized expertise in the course topic areas.

Four weekly, evening classes were designed. The Course is now offered on the first four Wednesdays of each month in the main troop area Chapel Center. Since everything seems to need a catchy phrase these days, the course was entitled "Marriage is for the Birds! Fact or Fiction?" The four subjects covered are: (1) Foundations for Marriage; (2) Marital Communication (both taught by a chaplain); (3) Financial Management (taught by the Army Community Service Social Work Officer); and (4) Marital Sexuality (taught by the authors, a married couple). In this article, we will discuss only the fourth evening of the series, namely the one concerning marital sexuality.

Marital Sexuality

Effective treatment of psychogenic sexual dysfunction (anorgasmia, low libido, absent vaginal lubrication, vaginismus, dyspareunia, premature ejaculation, retarded ejaculation, and erectile failure) began in the 1970's as

a result of the pioneering research of Masters and Johnson.

Masters and Johnson cite a sexual dysfunction rate of 50% among the general married population and 70% among couples who divorce.[1] Other studies have reported similar sexual dysfunction rates. A 1976 study at the University of Pittsburg reports a dysfunction rate of 62% for women and 41% for men among avowedly "happy" and successful marriages.[2] A recent epidemiological study done within the military revealed a sexual dysfunction rate of 76% among women presenting themselves for routine gynecologic examination.[3] It is abundantly clear that Americans in general are continuing to experience considerable "Dis-ease" in their sexual functioning.

A Three-Part Evening

After several revisions, we discovered that dividing the evening into three major parts or areas provided for more student involvement and a wider range of topics. We begin by addressing specific, practical "tips" or new knowledge derived from the latest research in human sexuality. We attempt to refute as many sexual myths as possible, and more importantly, establish our credibility as a couple by being open and "up-front" about our sexuality.

The second major area consists of sharing our gradual realization that sex is another avenue of communicating and, as such, it possesses never ending possibilities and richness. This awareness is contrasted with the currently popular view of sex as an activity or an end in itself.

The third major area is a personal sharing of Judeo-Christian perspectives regarding human sexuality. When we first began these marital sexuality evenings, we did not address this third area. We had a mistaken notion that those considering marriage might be turned off by religion and we didn't want to give anyone a "hard sell" on our own Christian values. We were wrong; the young people expected and wanted to learn theological insights regarding human sexuality. In a way, they were starving for more meaning in their lives.

Before turning to a fuller discussion of each of the three areas, some prefatory remarks are necessary. First, we believe it is preferable for a married couple to present this material, as opposed to an individual presentation by a single clergyperson or layperson. There are many reasons

---

[1] W.H. Masters, Presentation at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, Anaheim, CA, May, 1975.

[2] E. Frank, C. Anderson, and E. Curtis, *The Incidence of Sexual Difficulties in Normal Couples,* Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Association of Sex Therapy, New York, NY, March, 1977.

[3] Ed Biggerstaff III, J.R. David, and A.J. Lloyd, *The Incidence of Female Sexual Dysfunction Among U.S. Army Active Duty Soldiers and Military Dependents,* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors, and Therapists, Washington, D.C., 30 March-2 April, 1978.

for assuming this position but the main one, for us, is the modeling of a healthy, ongoing relationship as a distinct possibility, *i.e.,* marriage doesn't inevitably *have to* end in divorce and sexual communication can continue unabated and vigorous throughout the lifelong marital union.

Secondly, the setting is important. Hopefully, an atmosphere conducive to sharing sensitive concerns and issues can be developed. Stressing confidentiality is basic to the development of meaningful sharing and dialogue between the sharing couple and those attending. A quiet, secure setting helps to promote genuine openness.

We begin by introducing ourselves and giving our wedding date. We then shift the focus to them by asking each person to introduce himself or herself, their projected wedding date, if they have one, and where they plan to marry. This process helps us to relax with one another, gives us information with which to tailor the rest of the evening, and sets the stage for open sharing throughout the remainder of the evening.

We briefly share our excitement at being there with them. (It's easy to be positive and excited when you realize the opportunity this evening will have for making a lifelong impact upon a young couple.) We tell them we will be sharing our own experiences and what has made sense for us in communicating sexually as we have matured during fifteen years of marriage. We give them a brief overview of the evening, urging them to think of this time as *their* time and that they will gain as much or as little from it as they decide to get for themselves. Then we give each person a card and ask them to write down their personal questions or sharings. We collect these cards and answer their questions or share their comments at the end of the evening. This technique encourages questions that might be embarrassing for some to ask verbally. The entire session lasts a maximum of two hours, including a fifteen-minute break and a thirty-minute open discussion at the end.

Before turning to a detailed discussion of our presentation, we would like to stress two components that are essential for the presenting or sharing couple: (1) knowledge and (2) a comfortableness about and with sex. The former can be obtained by reading such references as are cited in this paper. The latter, however, is not so easily acquired but may be developed gradually through self-education, exploration, and willingness to get "on the firing line" by teaching a class such as described herein. Burnap and Golden have empirically demonstrated the essentiality of comfortableness on the part of sex educators if students are to forthrightly address their concerns.[4]

Part I: Practical Tips

While the sequence of the three parts may vary with the thinking of the

---

[4] D.W. Burnap and J.S. Golden, "Sexual Problems in Medical Practice," *Journal of Medicine,* ed. 42 (1967), 673-80.

presenting couple, we begin with "Practical Tips" because the material is more concrete. We begin by mentioning that our great societal interest in sex actually highlights our lack of mastery of this key area of life rather than our acceptance or comfortableness with it, as one might assume. The earlier cited research studies regarding the high incidence rate of sexual dysfunction are mentioned. (Further authoritative information may be obtained from *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality—750 Questions Answered by 500 Experts.*[5] The book provides up-to-date information about medical and psychological aspects of sexuality.) An annotated bibliography and two article reprints are provided each attendee at the close of the evening. The majority of the specific suggestions, or practical tips regarding sexuality, are derived from Annon's *Behavioral Treatment of Sexual Dysfunction—Volume I—Brief Treatment.*[6] Instead of impersonally "preaching" these suggestions, we do our best to share our own experiences in living them.

Use Clear Communication. Have the courage to tell your spouse what you like in positive terms as opposed to what you don't like in negative or denigrating terms. Gordon's *Parent Effectiveness Training*[7] is particularly helpful in differentiating between "you" messages which destroy "relationship" and "I" messages which build "relationship" while enabling the sender of the "I" message to get his or her needs met. For example, "*I* really like it when you lightly touch my breasts" as opposed to "*You* are always in such a hurry and so rough with my breasts. *You* never touch them right."

Change the goal. This is one of the major new insights contributed by the emerging field of sex and marital therapy. Too often any touching between spouses only means a desire for intercourse; intercourse becomes the only goal for touching. As a result, all touching may be studiously avoided when one or the other does not desire intercourse. We stress, "The only legitimate goal for you, when you come together to express your affection, is that at the end of that time you feel good and fulfilled about yourself individually and as a couple." We attempt to explain this concept by contrasting the traditional "stairway" sequence with a variety of coequal touching or sexual activity. Normally, couples ascend a stairway of kissing, fondling, caressing, and inevitably end in intercourse. What is suggested as an alternative is the honest sharing of what would be *mutually,* as well as morally, acceptable touching or sexual activity. If one partner needs reassurance, for instance, taking a walk and holding hands may be far more

---

[5] H.I. Wief, ed., *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality—750 Questions Answered by 500 Experts* (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins Co., 1974).

[6] J.S. Annon, *The Behavioral Treatment of Sexual Problems,* Vol. I (Hawaii: Enabling Systems, Inc., 1974).

[7] Thomas Gordon, *Parent Effectiveness Training* (New York: Peter H. Wyden, Inc., 1970).

reassuring than coitus. (For further discussion of this concept see Annon.[8])

Other relevant considerations, when addressing the concept of "Coequal Sexual Activities," are the issues of (1) values, (2) normalcy, and (3) control versus expression. Attendees are reminded that they are entitled to their own personal, aesthetic, and religious values. Permission should be given to *not* enjoy as well as to enjoy a given, specific sexual activity. Regarding normalcy, attendees are referred to the Kinsey and Hunt studies concerning the incidence rate of coitus, orgasm, oral sex, etc.[9] Again, what everyone else may or may not be doing does not make it "right" or "wrong" for every individual or couple.

"Control versus Expression" is a topic large enough for a separate paper. Some espouse mutual self control of sexual activity prior to and after marriage. Others espouse free expression, as in "Do your own thing!" or "Be free!" A middle ground is to encourage expression (realizing that strict control is either impossible or harmful or, as a minimum, unrealistic) in positive, constructive ways, such as dancing, holding hands, etc. Exact parallels may be made between human feelings and human sexuality. For example, if we try to over-control our feelings we will find that they seep out regardless of our efforts. At the other extreme, if we express all our feelings all the time we may be negativistic in our attempts to build relationships with people.

Changing the goal of sexual activity from achieving some sexual performance (such as orgasm, erection, or coitus) to a goal of simply feeling fulfilled helps to avoid the attitude of "It's now or never." Insisting upon a specific sexual goal invariably leads to stress, if not disappointment and disillusionment. In any event, seeking a specific goal, such as coital orgasm, is usually a sure way of never reaching that goal. To relieve the pressure of the moment, it is wise to live with the attitude, "There is always another day; another time."

"No Power." While the concept of "No Power" may seem idealistic to some, it is workable for a mature couple. "No Power" means giving up one's power to sexually reject his or her spouse, giving up the power to say "No!" to your spouse. This concept is mentioned in I Corinthians 7. The married individual no longer owns his or her body but agrees to give it totally to his or her spouse. At the same time, both agree never to initiate sexual activity if they have any idea that the other is not in the mood. Both then agree to become sensitively aware of the other and to assume shared, if not equal responsibility for initiating. Secondly, both agree *never* to say "No" if the other initiates. Thirdly, what the "Yes" will consist of may be negotiated so that mutual acceptability is attained. They may select any of

---

[8]Annon, *Sexual Problems.*

[9]A.C. Kinsey, et al, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1953); A.C. Kinsey, et al, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1948); M. Hunt, *Sexual Behavior in the 1970s* (Chicago: Playboy Press, 1974).

the coequal sexual activities they have developed within their unique value system.

Importance of Change. Someone has said that the only real aphrodisiacs are physical exercise, mental fantasy, and change or variety. Couples may retain a sense of excitement and keep stimulation alive by enlarging or varying their sexual repertoire in terms of location (*e.g.* moving sex out of the bedroom), time (daytime instead of nighttime), accessories (using oils, lotions, vibrators), technique (different coital positions, going slower), etc.

Self-Responsibility. No practical tip is more important than believing and behaving that "I am responsible for my own sexuality." Nobody can "turn me on" or "turn me off" except me. Nobody can *make* me reach orgasm; I have to "get into it" myself. I have to trust my spouse so I am able to "let go" and give my partner my greatest gift, my whole self in sexual abandonment.

Part II: Sex as Communication

In Part I we address some practical tips that relate to sex as an activity; in Part II, we share our personal pilgrimage in eventually discovering that sex as an activity is a dead-end street. It is when we begin to view marital sexuality as another form of communication (along with verbal and nonverbal communication) that it unfolds and reveals an endless depth and variety—simply because, as human beings, we have endless depth and variety. Communicating sexually requires as much care and attention as communicating verbally. Just as in conversation, communicating sexually involves listening as well as speaking, or being able to receive as well as to give. (Some people have no difficulty with giving/touching but are very resistant/uncomfortable with being touched/receiving.)

We begin by sharing what the sexual atmosphere was in our individual homes as we were growing up. We then personalized the outline quoted below.

> 1. All aspects of communication—verbal nonverbal, and sexual—increase, and even change, once a husband and wife have a total commitment to one another.
> 2. Every one of us, when we first marry, practices sex pretty much as an activity. We tend to divorce it from the rest of our life. In one compartment we have sexual life; in another compartment, the rest of our life.
> 3. We tend to treat sex as something that happens. But it can be more than that. We can choose to use it to build up our responsiveness to each other.
> 4. Intimacy comes out of experiencing the other person—not out of the activity. Sex won't be intimate unless you and I are fully involved and aware— on all levels of our personhood.
> 5. Sex gets boring after a while, even if we try new techniques. But we are new and different daily, and we can discover new sides of each other through our sex.
> 6. Unless our sex is surrounded by the other ways of communicating—

before, during and after—it's going to be a superficial experience.

7. After sex, some people say, "Did I understand you correctly when you said such-and-such a thing with your body?"

8. We can say we're communicating through sex. But do I communicate to you my feelings of inadequacy in sexual matters? Do I let you know how desirable I think you are, or how anxious I am to please you, to be close to you? Do I let you know about my hurts, my fear of growing old, my concern about being unattractive? Do I tell you about my joy in you, my reverence for you? Do I encourage and help you to tell me about your fears, your pleasures, your frustrations, your desire to be forgiven, cherished, protected, consoled?

9. Sex has so much to do with our basic ability as a husband and wife to communicate with each other. What a barometer it can be to our relationship as a couple.[10]

Part III: Theological Perspectives

Hopefully, by this point in the evening, we have established credibility with the young adults and we feel sufficiently secure and relaxed to share some of our religious beliefs relevant to marital sexuality. Care is taken to present commonly held Judeo-Christian tenets so as to minimize possible doctrinal argumentation.

We've been pleasantly surprised with attendees' eagerness for the ideas presented in the second and third sections of the talk. Viktor Frankl's insight regarding man's incessant striving for meaningfulness in every moment of life is most alive in this setting.[11] Young people are searching for true-meaning and true-value in our pluralistic society. The "Christ-Value" and the "Christ-Meaning"[12] certainly deserve equal time, alongside secular movies, television and the newstand.

We begin with a brief historical overview of authentic and inauthentic Christian views regarding sexuality. Traditional views have often been interpreted as being anti-sexual, but recent popular, Christian literature enthusiastically supports sexual behavior as morally positive. The recent *Redbook* survey of female sexual satisfaction is cited as an indication of the facile congruence between authentic Christianity and sexual fulfillment.[13]

The remaining conceptualizations are taken from a previously published article, "Christian Perspectives on the Treatment of Sexual Dysfunction." Again, the concepts are shared in the tradition of self-disclosure popularized by Jourard.[14]

The Flesh Versus the Spirit. The traditional admonition to set aside things of the flesh ("world" in preference to "spiritual" or "other worldly"

---

[10]Charles Gallagher and Joe and Judy McDonald, *Matrimony: Jesus Invites Us To Love* (New York: William H. Sadlier, Inc., 1976), pp.156-7.

[11]Viktor Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning* (New York: Picket Books, 1972).

[12]B.J. Tyrell, *Christotherapy: Healing Through Enlightenment* (New York: Picket Books, 1972).

[13]Claire Safran, "65,000 Women Reveal: How Religion Affects Health, Happiness, Sex, and Politics," *Redbook* Vol. 148, No. 6 (April, 1977).

[14]J.R. David and F. C. Duda, "Christian Perspectives on the Treatment of Sexual Dysfunction," *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (1977), pp. 332-336.

concerns) is countered with the basic theological tenet that God is good and all that he made is good. It is misuse or unchanneled involvement in material/worldly/sexual affairs that are counter-productive for the sincere Christian.

Separateness Versus Unity. Man's unalterable separateness and his ceaseless, unquenchable stirring to overcome his separateness are discussed and then linked with the Christian theological position that heaven consists of being merged or united with God. Eric Fromm recognized our separateness/aloneness and articulated his views in the now classic *The Art of Loving:*

> Assent is sought that all of us as humans suffer from separateness; that, as hard as we may try, we are unable to overcome our being separate from one another; and, that often our behavior manifests our yearning to overcome our separateness or aloneness and to experience the pleasant relief that occasions closeness with another human being.[15]

> Fromm's belief that man has inbred in him an insatiable desire to overcome this separateness, that he senses his incompleteness as an individual person, and the Christian belief that man will only be appeased by ultimately being united with God in heaven are woven together. We go on to say that it appears that the finest, most sublime foretaste of heaven (over-coming separateness and attaining oneness) lies in sexual intercourse and that God wants us to experience this joyful foretaste of heavenly unity.[16]

Coupleness. Another effective way of establishing the sacredness of the human sexual relationship is to share the mystery of the fifth chapter of Ephesians:

> Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church. He gave himself up for her to make her holy, purifying her in a bath of water by the power of the world . . . . Husbands should love their wives as they do their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. Observe that no one ever hates his own flesh; no, he nourishes it and takes care of it as Christ cares for the church—for we are members of His body.[17]

These thoughts should be shared spontaneously at an appropriate moment. We cannot offer a formula for what must be a creative endeavor.

We point out that St. Paul used the oneness of the couple to illustrate that Christ is the head of His Body, the Church, and that He is as intimately united with us, His Church, as husbands and wives are united. He continues to depend upon couples to reveal the reality of His love relationship with His Church. Couples do this best simply by being united; it is not what they do, rather it is that they are with and for one another. Just as God reveals Himself to us through the Scriptures so He would have us reveal ourselves to one another in frank, understandable human terms.

We combine this insight with Genesis: "For this reason a man shall

---

[15] Eric Fromm, *The Art of Loving* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).
[16] David, "Christian Perspectives."
[17] Ephesians 5:25-26.

leave his father and mother, and shall cling to his wife, and the two shall be made into one."[18]

Another aspect is communicated by sharing John Powell's views regarding the etiology of the word "sex." It comes from the Latin verb *sacare*, which means "to cut." Men and women are figuratively "cut in half" and, in being joined together, they regain the wholeness they desire.[19]

If couples are to put things back together again, it is necessary that each one knows how things fit; one cannot expect to know how things fit unless the other clearly tells the partner in detail the delicate nuances of personal responses and preferences. We share the beauty we see in this and the serenity that it brings; it is comforting to see oneself as definitely living out God's desire.

Letting Go. This is a central theme for modern man. More and more, men and women are culturally conditioned to believe that they do have the power to control all events in their lives. Man sees himself as "prime reality" rather than God. So accustomed to being "in control," he (or she) has great difficulty in "letting go." The Christian understandably will be better prepared to "let go" sexually. The more we are able to accept our interdependence with one another and our dependence upon God for everything, the better equipped we are to surrender sexually, to abandon ourselves.

Conclusion

The American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors and Therapists (AASECT) has published a guide for the development of sex education programs. The brochure provides definite steps for developing programs such as (1) Assessment of Need and Institutional Pressures (2) Involvement of Community Representatives, (3) Curriculum Development, (4) Integrating Personal Counseling into the Program, and (5) Continuing Evaluation of the Program.[20] Readers may wish to acquaint themselves with this and other relevant sex education literature.[21]

An obvious shortcoming of the model described here is the current lack of an objective measure of participant satisfaction. At the same time, many modifications have been made as a result of our verbal request for constructive feedback at the end of each session. While participants have felt free to voice negative and positive responses the need to establish an objective evaluation process is indicated.

---

[18]Genesis 2:24

[19]John Powell, *The Secret of Staying in Love* (Niles, Illinois: Argus Communications, 1974).

[20]M.A. Kelly, *Sex Education for Adolescents and Youth* (Washington, D.C.: AASECT, 1977).

[21]W.R. Johnson and E.G. Belzer, *Human Sexual Behavior and Sex Education* (Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1973). H. Katchadourian and D. Lunde, *Fundamentals of Human Sexuality* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1975); G.F. Kelly, *Teacher's Manual for Learning About Sex* (Woodbury, NY: Barron's Educational Series, 1976): AASECT, *The Professional Training and Preparation of Sex Educators* (Washington, D.C.: AASECT, 1972).

In a way, this article has been a miniature reflection of our involvement in the vital program of marriage preparation. We have shared our experiences and hope we have also demonstrated some of the important practical, communicative and theological aspects to human sexuality.

Bibliography

Annon, J.S. *The Behavioral Treatment of Sexual Problems.* Vol. 1. Hawaii: Enabling Systems, Inc., 1974.

AASECT. *The Professional Training and Preparation of Sex Educators.* Washington, D.C.: AASECT, 1972.

Biggerstaff, Ed III, David, J.R., Lloyd, A.J.: *The Incidence of Female Sexual Dysfunction Among U.S. Army Active Duty Soldiers and Military Dependents.* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Sex Educators, Counselors, and Therapists, Washington, D.C., 30 March-2 April, 1978.

Burnap, D.W., and Golden, J.S. "Sexual Problems in Medical Practice," *Journal of Medicine,* Ed. 42 (1967), 673-80.

David, J.R. and Duda, F.C. "Christian Perspectives on the Treatment of Sexual Dysfunction." *Journal of Psychology and Theology,* Vol. 5, No. 4. (1977), pp332-336.

Frank, E.; Anderson, C.; and Curtis, E. *The Incidence of Sexual Difficulties in Normal Couples.* Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Association of Sex Therapy, New York, New York, March, 1977.

Frankl, Viktor. *Man's Search for Meaning.* New York: Picket Books. 1972.

Fromm, Eric. *The Art of Loving,* New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Gallagher, Charles, and McDonald, Joe and Judy, *Matrimony; Jesus Invites Us to Love.* New York: William H. Sadlier, Inc., 1976 pp. 156-7.

Gordon, Thomas. *Parent Effectiveness Training.* New York: Peter H. Wyden Inc., 1970.

Hunt, M. *Sexual Behavior in the 1970's.* Chicago: Playboy Press, 1974.

Johnson, W.R., and Belzer, E.G. *Human Sexual Behavior and Sex Education.* Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1973.

Katchadourian, H., and Lunde, D. *Fundamentals of Human Sexuality.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1975.

Kelly, G.F. *Teacher's Manual for Learning About Sex.* Woodbury, NY: Barron's Educational Series, 1976.

Kelly, M.A. *Sex Education for Adolescents and Youth,* Washington, D.C.: AASECT, 1977.

Kinsey, A.C., et al. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female.* Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1953.

Kinsey, A.C., et al. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male.* Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1948.

Masters, W.H. Presentation at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, Anaheim, California, May, 1975.

Powell, John. *The Secret of Staying in Love.* Niles, Illinois: Argus Communications, 1974.

Safran, Claire. "65,000 Women Reveal: How Religion Affects Health, Happiness, Sex and Politics." *Redbook,* Vol. 148, No. 6 (April, 1977).

Shor, J., and Sanville, J. "Erotic Provocations and Dalliances in Psychotherapeutic Practice." *Clinical Social Work,* 1974, 2(2).

Tyrell, B.J. *Christotherapy; Healing Through Enlightenment.* New York: The Seabury Press, 1974.

Wief, J.I., ed. *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality—750 Questions Answered by 500 Experts.* Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins Co., 1974.

Supervisory Effectiveness Training: A New P.E.T. Model for Ministry to The "System"

Chaplain (CPT) Charles Daniel Witmer

In the Spring 1978 issue of the *Military Chaplains' Review,* two articles were written and placed in juxtaposition on the issue of ministry to "systems." Chaplain (COL) Mark M. McCullough, Jr., argued against Christians ministering to systems and for keeping the focus of ministry on the individual. Chaplain (MAJ) Carl R. Stephens described his imperatives for why the "prophetic ministry to the institution" or "system" is a vital role for chaplains.

I choose not to argue the merits or demerits of these two well-written, well-reasoned articles. Instead, I would like to share with you my own personal experience as it evolved during a three-year period and eventually developed into a dynamic, ongoing program of ministry to leaders (the "system")—and through leaders to the soldiers (the individual)—in the 7th Infantry Division at Ft. Ord, California.

The vehicle of this ministry was the use of the chaplain-taught course, "Personal Effectiveness Training"—but *not* in its traditional format. What I would like to report to you is the development of an entirely new format for P.E.T. which impacts directly on the company grade leadership chain. The focus of this "new" P.E.T. is the first line supervisor—the leader who deals every day on an eye-ball to eye-ball basis with the soldier. In order to emphasize the unique qualities of this special version of P.E.T., the name "Supervisory Effectiveness Training" is coined for this article—drawing special attention to the target of these classes. The latter part of this article will deal very specifically with the components of Supervisory Effectiveness Training, but right now I feel the need to share with you the key events that led to the development and successful implementation of S.E.T. at Ft. Ord.

Chaplain Witmer, a pastor of the American Lutheran Church, returned to active reserve status after a three-year tour at Ft. Ord. He currently directs the Ft. Ord campus of Monterey Peninsula College. A state-licensed Marriage, Family & Child Counselor, he has conducted numerous college courses and in-service programs in family dynamics, adolescent behavior, classroom discipline, and communication principles. For his service to the 7th Division, he was awarded the Meritorious Service Medal.

The Challenge of Ministry to the Soldier and the Leadership Chain

When I entered active duty from civilian life, with four years Reservist experience, I was assigned to the newly activated 7th Division and to its 2nd Brigade. I not only found myself in the unique situation of being new on active duty, but being the only chaplain in the brigade—with two battalions and 1200 soldiers to "minister to. . . ." This situation lasted for nine months, during which time I performed all the traditional roles of the chaplain in a troop unit: Preaching and conducting chapel services, visiting troops in garrison and field settings, attending staff meetings, conducting worship in the field, and counseling the soldier and his dependents. During this time my concentration of ministry was focused on the needs of the soldier as an individual. My counseling load, as sole brigade chaplain, was quite heavy—but I didn't mind this because this was the very area that my non-military training had best equipped me to serve. Thus, the counseling side of "ministry to the needs of individuals" was an interesting and accepted role.

However, I soon learned that in the military there are "two sides to any coin," and when the majority of personal problems of the individual soldier began to focus on the poor kinds of inter-personal relationships between the enlisted soldier and the NCO-Officer leadership chain, I went to each immediate link in that particular chain of command to find out "What's going on here?" What I discovered was a great deal of frustration, anger and tension in the lives of leaders at the company level. The reason? The leaders had to deal with the myriad of "personal problems" of the new "volunteer" soldiers, who were arriving every day at Ft. Ord. These problems, they felt, were being brought into the Army from civilian life.

Analyzing the Problem Facing the Supervisory Chain and Developing a Plan

Quite frankly, I was appalled at the lack of understanding and level of counseling skills I encountered at the company and battalion level chain of command—especially with the NCO leadership. Yet, I also listened to the frustrations of the leaders and learned of their dilemma in having to shape a combat-ready infantry division from green, inexperienced volunteers who didn't seem, to the majority of these leaders, as being the least bit interested in soldiering. The fact that these persons had not been drafted, but had, in fact, *volunteered* was particularly galling to most NCO's. The situation got so bad that one of our battalions had the dubious distinction of having the highest AWOL rate in the U.S. Army for one month.

In my position as the only brigade chaplain, I had access to the personal needs and problems of both the soldiers and the leaders at every step along the rank structure. It seemed at first to be a hopeless, "no win" situation. What to do? Yes, what *do* you do?

The traditional role of the chaplain seemed to say I should continue to minister to the needs of individuals, no matter what their rank or situation—but my heart told me there had to be a better way. There must be a way to reach both the chain of command plus the enlisted personnel in order to break down the walls of hostility that had been erected in just a few months and assist in creating an atmosphere of mutual respect (Ephesians 2:14).

Perhaps, I reasoned, the frustrations of the leaders were being perceived by the average soldier as an "I-don't-care-about-you" attitude. This, of course, is bound to create the same reaction in reverse among subordinates in any "system." I also found that in my day-to-day counseling with the personal problems of the soldier, almost 75% of the problems could have been handled at the squad, platoon, or company level with some elementary counseling skills coupled with an overall "caring" attitude.

Prior Experience Leads to a "Teaching Ministry" Concept

Prior to my active duty service, I had been engaged in teaching numerous professional workshops for school teachers, probation officers, and others who worked with youngsters and their families. The content of these courses focused on the family and its dynamic interaction patterns, child and adolescent development, and methods of coping constructively with uncooperative, rebellious behavior. Yet, I wasn't sure if what I had been teaching in the private sector would have any direct application to the military setting of a Combat Arms infantry unit. However, since my most popular course for school teachers was titled: "Maintaining Discipline in the Classroom," I felt I could combine the caring-counseling skills necessary to meet the needs of the soldier along with the leadership-discipline needs of the supervisor so that the mission could be accomplished with a minimum of personal turbulence.

My first attempt to implement a class to teach the above concepts was in the "record AWOL" battalion. I was given permission to teach a 10-hour course, per company, to all NCO and Company Grade Officers. My initial reaction was: "What can I do in 10 hours?" It's like taking a teaspoon to the ocean! But it was a foot in the door! To my amazement, the feedback forms from the NCO's and lieutenants that took the training were almost 100% positive. I also learned that these leaders were indeed caring people — they just didn't know *how* to *care* and get the *mission* done too, as if these two points are always an "either-or" proposition.

In addition to the above lessons learned during this 10-hour class, I found a special "bonus." I found that my presence as a concerned chaplain-instructor, trying to help leaders at the bottom of the chain cope with problems that appeared insurmountable at their level, seemed to open new pathways of ministry for me within the "AWOL battalion." I was perceived by the leaders at squad, platoon, and company level (as well as at battalion)

as a chaplain who "understood" their needs, problems, and pressures. In business terms, I ended up being "hired" by everyone along the chain as their consultant for personal, morale, and spiritual problems.

A Massive Training Opportunity Forces A New Course Design

It took a battalion commander completely outside of my own chain of command to move into Phase II of my ministry to the "system." The new commander of the Division's engineer battalion had inherited a unit with even more morale problems than the infantry! He was looking for help, had experienced the Personal Effectiveness Training (traditional model) in Europe and wanted some training for his NCO's that would help develop their skills in counseling. However, even more importantly, he wanted something to change their *attitudes* toward the volunteer soldier of today. He, like myself, had detected a definite tone of animosity and intolerance on the part of his NCO's, and he wanted some kind of program that would get these supervisors to even *want* to listen to their own soldiers' problems, let alone resolve them! Although the 10-hour course taught for the infantry battalion was titled "Leadership Effectiveness" in counseling skills, I decided to go with what the commander had already experienced and call the course he was anxious to start: "Personal Effectiveness Training." (The ensuing confusion between what was taught at Ft. Ord and the more familiar version of P.E.T. is understandable, but this article is an attempt to deliniate the unique characteristics of the Ft. Ord Program).

When the engineer battalion commander asked me how much time I would need to teach his NCO's the basic skills necessary to change things, I asked for 30 hours for each supervisor, hoping I would get 20. When I got the whole 30 hours, I was almost in a state of shock! This is when it became necessary to design a course that covered all the essential elements I had hoped to be able to teach during the first "leadership" training project with the infantry.

The 30-hour training course that evolved for the engineer battalion became a specially designed professional development workshop aimed at producing major change in the attitudes of the first line supervisors (NCO and Officer), reference their leadership methods of motivating today's volunteer soldier. The engineer battalion chaplain, (CPT) Temple G. Matthews III, and I developed a training format to teach four groups of 24 NCO's 30 hours each of Supervisory Effectiveness Training (see accompanying article by LTC Don W. Barber, C.E.). We were also able to accomplish 14 hours of training for all the officers of the battalion.

Results Pay Off In Unit Effectiveness—And A New Assignment

The results of the engineer battalion project were beyond our highest

expectations—especially in the area of the increase in efficiency and productivity of the unit in accomplishment of the *mission*. This was the apparent bonus of the improved caring relationships between supervisors and soldiers within the battalion. Thus, we had some evidence of the actual connection between increased *caring* and increased job efficiency.

As a result of the resounding success of the engineer battalion project, I was assigned full time as the P.E.T. Project Officer of the 7th Infantry Division by personal selection of the Commanding General. (It seems the General took note of the high performance level of his engineer battalion, and when he found out the contribution of the Supervisory Effectiveness—P.E.T. to this performance, it didn't take long for the assignment to take place.) Thus, from 3 January through mid-June 1978 (the completion date of my 3-year tour at Ft. Ord), I was involved in teaching NCO's and officers S.E.T., as well as implementing the program on battalion training schedules. This became my full time job—and by this time I had been able to boil down the elements of the course of instruction to *16 hours* of very tight, very specifically planned content and exercises aimed at producing maximum attitude change in the participants. The initial parts of the course focused on personal awareness of attitude and leadership style. The middle sections dealt with basic counseling skills. The conclusion of the course aimed at a review of effective, non-punitive methods of discipline and personal motivation.

All in all, over 400 NCO's and approximately 85 officers received instruction in Supervisory Effectiveness Training. (Twenty-five Navy officers and NCO's also received 20 hours of training in a special project approved by the Division Commander in May 1978).

What were the results? First of all, this was not a social science project. We did not administer any "attitude tests" or collect any specific data from the unit level, other than participant evaluation forms. My job was strictly to teach the content of the specifically designed modules and move on to the next group. There was little time for careful follow-up— mainly because the command within the Division was already sold on the course and didn't need to be convinced by other data.

Nevertheless, some rather solid evidence has emerged from those units that received 16 hours of training. The feedback forms from those attending both the NCO and Officer classes were filled with strongly worded statements in support of this kind of training (both in content and process)—especially since it had such direct practical application to the role of the first line supervisor in the military setting. The fact that the course was taught by a chaplain was at first seen as a roadblock, but then became one of the course's greatest attributes, according to most feedback. On the statistical side, in units I was able to follow-up on in which commanders or key NCO's demonstrated they were practicing the precepts learned, AWOL's have almost disappeared, and Article 15 punishment has dropped some 50-80%. Also, in units where the majority of officers and NCO's received similar training and where the communication model designed

into the course has been practiced within the company chain of command, NCO morale has sky-rocketed. Apparently, the by-product of all this concentration on supervisory leadership skills has been that the individual needs of the soldiers are being given more time and attention. The trade-off is that the *performance* goal of the mission has not *dropped* in any of these units. The commanders and NCOs interviewed attribute this to the increased cooperative atmosphere in their units. (Our training goal).

The Basic Components Of Supervisory Effectiveness Training

Thus far I have outlined for you, in a first-person account, my experience at ministry in the 7th Infantry Division. From an original "traditional" ministry to individuals, there developed a rather specialized teaching-training ministry to leaders within the "system." I'm sure that by now many of you are asking more fundamental questions—like: "Just what is this S.E.T. version of P.E.T.?" "What's so different about Ft. Ord's Program from the P.E.T. training chaplains have been doing for several years?" And ultimately, "Is this new version of P.E.T. something I might be able to incorporate into my teaching ministry?"

I think the key to the uniqueness of the Supervisory Effectiveness Training model developed at Ft. Ord is the initial focus on the attitude of the leader, with the specific goal of impacting on his methods of leadership and motivation of troops. Once the desired "openness" in attitude is achieved, (that "caring" attitude), then the remainder of the workshop focuses on the skills or tools necessary for effective leadership at the company, squad, and platoon level.

To be even more *specific*, let me point out some of the major differences between Supervisory Effectiveness Training and the more official version of P.E.T.: First, the P.E.T. course designed at the U. S. Army Chaplain Center & School relies heavily on Transactional Analysis as its basic communication-teaching tool. Supervisory Effectiveness-P.E.T. utilizes *no* T.A. training at all. Second, although the official P.E.T. course deals with teaching-counseling skills (non-directive), the S.E.T. version of P.E.T. focuses on basic components of communication (Sender-Receiver Models) and teaches facilitative skills that depend on what the given task of the leader is at any given moment—as a Sender or a Receiver. Finally, S.E.T. focuses on behavior as a "systems relationship," and zeros in on *patterns* of leadership response. As such, S.E.T. focuses directly upon the key factor of individual and unit discipline from the *leader's* perspective.

Rather than approach the leader with a pre-set model of communication and attempt to teach the first line supervisor to "buy my model" the design of the S.E.T. course began with an analysis of how the supervisor sees the soldier. In quickest summary, I discovered that the typical squad leader, platoon sergeant, first sergeant, or company grade officer sees the average soldier today through virtually the same pair of glasses. To the

dedicated "first line supervisor," today's volunteer soldier is immature, centered on self and personal problems, and not really interested in soldiering. Personal problems, on the whole, are ignored by such supervisors because they are interpreted as "cry baby" activities. The merest suggestion that the manner in which today's "volunteer" soldier was being approached by the supervisor was actually compounding the problem was usually met with this leadership rationale: "Let the *soldier* change—it's *his* problem, not mine." The 16-hour training program of Supervisory Effectiveness Training has definitely made some dents in this "attitude barrier."

How has the leadership attitude barrier been broken? By the use of "systems theory" applied to the basic social system of our society—the *family*. Through the use of family dynamics and an overview of the social-family setting of most of today's "volunteer" soldiers, the leaders in S.E.T.-P.E.T. training are shown exactly where the new soldier is coming from in his personal and family heritage and just how he differs drastically (in many important respects) from his draftee counterpart of previous days. Special note is made of the specific problems many teenagers of the "Post Vietnam Era" have in dealing with authority figures.

By the use of a "system" all of us have experienced to one degree or another—namely, the *family*, and by showing the current status and impact of "family dynamics" on the lives of so many teenagers today—the "attitude barrier" listed above has been successfully bridged so that participants eagerly look for new ways of coping with today's "new" soldier. (The above information I received in my specialized training as a family therapist [see bibliography].)

The Strategic Components of Supervisory Effectiveness Training (Modules)

In an overview, the strategic components of P.E.T.-S.E.T. are:

1. After an opening "icebreaker" exercise, the participant is introduced to the above-mentioned "attitude breaker" series of exercises and lectures on the topic of *"roots."* The focus is on the roots of family interaction and communication. Center stage during this portion of instruction is the increasing problem (developmentally) of communication between adults/leaders and youth, showing the effects of a sociological era stressing personal growth/personal freedom as these values impact upon the stability of the home and family. Typical family patterns of rivalry for status and attention between first born, second born, middle and youngest child are carefully programmed into this initial session. The inevitable result has been that the participants not only see the unique family patterns of today's teenager, but also examine the roots of their own family background in the process. Feedback from participants indicates that this segment has had a profound effect on their own lives—especially in their *own* families between themselves, their spouses and children.

2. Participants are led from a systems understanding of the family

to an introduction of behavior patterns. The teaching tool here is the Four Goals of Misbehavior (by Rudolf Dreikurs). These goals or patterns (Attention Getting, Power, Revenge, Assuming a Disability) emerge from the dynamics of family interaction in the early developmental years of the child. The evolution of this "role identification" process moves these patterns from the home to the school and eventually into the Army. These patterns are noted and discussed by the participants. Illustrations taken from Army life that pinpoint how these behavioral goals or patterns can still operate in the life of a 19-20 year-old soldier are passed out for group discussion and problem solving. The "gestalt" type awareness reaction on the part of participants, when shown how such patterns actually exist in the lives of their subordinates, seems to be validated and reaffirmed during this phase. Countless other illustrations of soldiers' behavior in specific unit situations are supplied by the participants in every group to reinforce each "sample illustration" provided.

3. At this point in "PET II," usually about six hours into the course, the participants are experiencing a real breakthrough in their own personal learning and growth. The validity of the "systems" explanation of family patterns, as well as the four basic goals of misbehavior, have been confirmed and reaffirmed. It's like being given the answer to a perceptual puzzle that first appears as nothing more than a group of lines or squiggles with no apparent pattern. Once you are shown the pattern, the experienced response is usually: "Wow, why didn't I see that before? Now I know what he's up to!" And once this statement is made, the leaders are more open to say: "What do I do now? How can I help this guy? How can I help myself from falling into the interpersonal traps and games that I've been falling for so often before?" When this happens, I've found that I have a captive audience, eagerly awaiting the tools necessary to learn more effective ways of working with subordinates.

4. Participants are now introduced to a segment on basic communication. A diagram model of the components of communication becomes a teaching tool that constantly is reinforced for the remainder of the class. The model emphasizes the role of Sender and Receiver, focusing on four components of "Code" (the message content, tone of voice, body language, "hidden meanings" in words) as a complete "package" that *becomes* "communication" only when the parties are aware of all parts of the package. Special role plays and participation exercises focus mostly on the importance of the Receiver role—especially in counseling type situations. Participants report that the insights gained about "receiving" or listening have given them the patience necessary to give the time to soldiers who need an ear to chew on—and nothing more!

5. Leaders are introduced to basic counseling techniques, revolving around Dr. Thomas Gordon's Rectangle as a teaching concept—with special emphasis on "Problem Ownership" and leadership styles. Non-

directive facilitation skills, assertion skills, and a six-step logical problem solving process first used by the educator, Thomas Dewey, are outlined to the participants as "tools" they may wish to adapt in enhancing their ability to improve communication with their subordinates. No attempt is made to "sell" participants on these skills. They are seen as components of a well rounded leadership style which can be of significant help—thus far, this "soft" approach to counseling techniques has found about a 90% acceptance ratio.

6. In a military setting, much of what a leader does is action oriented. Sitting and listening are foreign to those who think that when a soldier isn't in motion he isn't working. With this dynamic in mind, the participant is introduced to six specific strategies of intervention aimed at turning around the negative behavior pattern of an uncooperative soldier. This segment of S.E.T. has been one of the most highly accepted and is the most fun to teach, because it involves lots of role plays and "hamming it up." The Six Strategies are introduced in the form of relationship "Axioms":

    (1) Encouragement, the only antidote for discouraged behavior.
    (2) Action, not words.
    (3) Use Consequences, not Punishment: Natural Consequences
                                   (definition)
                                   Logical Consequences
                                   (definition)
    (4) Firmness, but without domination.
    (5) Withdrawal, for self-respect.
    (6) It takes time to build relationships.

The above six "strategies of intervention" are each illustrated by role-play situations, teacher "modeling" of acceptable strategies vs. improper techniques and first hand experiential "stories" or case history illustrations which help define the specifics of each strategy.

7. Having introduced the concept of "consequences" as an action strategy aimed at changing a negative behavior pattern of an uncooperative soldier, the final section of P.E.T.-S.E.T. comes to grips with the bottom line of all leadership skills in a military setting—namely, the *authority* of the leader. In any human-relations, human-self-development training session, unless the issue of the authority of the leader is successfully addressed, all relationship skills will tend to be regarded with suspicion by first line supervisors—no matter what kind of organization they work for. The bottom line in any organization is its productivity and the willingness on the part of its employees to "do what they are paid to do," whatever that may be. In the Combat Arms environment, it is *essential* that the authority of the leader at every level be protected. This brings up the entire topic of *discipline*. Discipline is the absolute end of all military life. Without it, there could be no hope of combat effectiveness. In Supervisory Effectiveness

P.E.T. the importance of discipline is stressed, but the issue shifts to the focus on the *techniques* of discipline. If performance and reliance is the bottom line of unit efficiency, what kinds of disciplinary methods and styles of leadership will *best* meet that need?

In today's Volunteer Army, the "old Army" style of one-way, Sender-only communication does not produce disciplined troops—it produces the opposite effect! By the conclusion of Supervisory Effectiveness Training, the participants have intellectually and experientially crossed that bridge—seeing that their previous styles of leadership are mostly ineffective in dealing with today's volunteer. What we provide the leader with is a concept chart in which the *motivation* and underlying *purpose* of discipline is examined by placing in juxtaposition the strategy of *punishment* as a form of leadership retaliation for perceived wrongs on the part of the soldier versus the strategy of *"consequence management,"* in which the soldier's uncooperative, immature behavior is constantly monitored and the soldier is given a series of "advance warnings" of the consequence of unacceptable behavior. The entire skills of the previous 15 hours of training are focused on the role-playing and teacher-modeling of this technique of discipline. Under this system, consistent—"no surprise"— methods are utilized in such a way that the soldier himself is often brought into the process of setting his own consequence for unacceptable behavior. Behavior contracting, tips for "keeping your cool" in the face of insubordinate actions planned to upset the leader's feelings, and methods of insuring that peer pressure is brought on the uncooperating squad member by his own peers, dominate this final session. The contrasting style of "I'll burn you for that . . ." or similar threats given in the vein of punishment and revenge are shown in such a way that leaders can see which system looks like it will have the greatest chance of gaining the soldier's cooperation. Thus far, the vast majority of participants have voted for "consequences" instead of vengeful "punishment" as their basic leadership style.

So there you have it, a summary of 16 hours of specialized modules designed to improve the relationship between the company grade leader and the soldier he must lead. But is this program something that *other* chaplains can use in their own units? I would have to say—"Absolutely!"

S.E.T. Being Used By Other Chaplains—With Special "Bonuses"

Special introductory training sessions for other chaplains within the 7th Division interested in teaching along the outlines of Supervisory Effectiveness-P.E.T. were held. About six chaplains have already taught several sections of NCO and Officer groups, and ongoing training plans call for more development of course modules so that up to 12 chaplains will be equipped to teach this format to first line supervisors in their own units.

Those chaplains who have been willing to "launch out" in their own units report excellent feedback from their leadership chain. The new Division Commander, Major General Phillip Feir, along with his Chief of Staff are both solidly pushing the program, which makes the "selling" of the unit chaplain as instructor, at the battalion level, a much easier task.

The "special bonus" of the S.E.T.-P.E.T. program, as experienced by myself and those other chaplains using the same format, is that by meeting a particularly difficult *need* of the Command—namely, to upgrade the leadership-caring skills of first line supervisors, the individual chaplain now reaps the *bonus* of having his *own* needs of ministry met by the command. By meeting the needs of the commander in an area where he may be hurting, the doors to all kinds of personal, Christian witness (evangelism) type ministry have been opened. Participating chaplains report that the "open door" to all levels of command is *really open*—and the suggestions of the chaplain in spiritual areas of troop ministry are being accepted with enthusiasm. Thus, by ministering to the leaders (who make the system go), the chaplain utilizing supervisory Effectiveness-P.E.T. can actually enhance his ministry to the individual soldier and every person's spiritual needs.

Supervisory Effectiveness Training—a new format of Personal Effectiveness Training—is a basic skills leadership course that has made its mark on the participants who have experienced 16-30 hours of chaplain-led training. It attempts to show first line supervisors a different way to cope and become more effective, caring leaders in the difficult world of a Combat Arms soldier. It is a potent tool in a chaplain's ministry to troops.

Bibliography: Supervisory Effectiveness Training

Dreikurs, Rudolph; *Psychology in the Classroom,* 2nd Edition. New York. Harper and Row. 1968.

Dreikurs, Grunwald, Pepper; *Maintaining Sanity in the Classroom,* New York. Harper and Row. 1971.

Gordon, Thomas; *Leadership Effectiveness Training* (L.E.T.). New York. Wyden Books. 1977.

Lowe, R. N. et al. editors; *Adlerian Family Counseling, A Manual For Counseling Centers.* Eugene, Oregon. University of Oregon Press. 1959.

Nikelly, Arthur, editor; *Techniques For Behavior Change: Application Of Adlerian Theory.* Springfield, Ill. C. C. Thomas. 1976.

The Impact of "Personal Effectiveness Training" for Supervisors (S.E.T.) In One Battalion

LTC Don W. Barber, C.E.

When I assumed command of my engineer battalion in December 1976, the unit had been in existence for 18 months, as a part of the newly activated Seventh Division. Yet, in that time, I inherited a real "can of worms."

In the first three months of my command, I was appalled by what I learned. Morale was almost non-existent. AWOL's, Article 15's, Courts-martial and Chapter 13 discharges were among the highest in the Division. The readiness posture of the battalion was highly questionable. The job of changing the battalion to become what I expected, a *Combat* Engineer unit, seemed almost insurmountable.

I spent much of my time in my first few weeks of command asking questions and listening to answers. I was particularly interested in how my enlisted E-2 to E-4 troops felt about their battalion. Every soldier I stopped (or who stopped me—and plenty of them did in those first weeks) seemed to be filled with complaints. When I analyzed the nature of their gripes, it appeared to me that they focused on two major areas—living conditions and "undue harrassment from NCO's and some officers."

Since Ft. Ord had been a basic training post for years, the barracks we inherited consisted of spartan, open bay settings. This situation was extremely difficult for the single enlisted soldier. We immediately set about to improve the barracks by ordering new beds, new footlockers, and curtains for each bay. Major structural improvements to the barracks were not programmed to be completed for two years. When new items started arriving, the morale of the single soldier began to improve—but this was only the tip of the iceberg. We had a long way to go—and persistent problems seemed to point directly to the relationship between NCO's and enlisted personnel in the battalion.

LTC Barber commanded the 13th Engineers from December 1976 to June 1978. An ROTC graduate of the University of Tennessee, LTC Barber also received a Master of Science Degree in Civil Engineering from the University of Tennessee. He has served in Engineer units stateside, in Europe, Vietnam, and was assigned to the US Naval Support Force, Antarctica. His current assignment is with the Office of the Inspector General, Washington, D.C.

Previous Contact with P.E.T. Opens the Door to Possible Unit Application

When I was the Executive Officer of a combat engineer battalion in Europe (my previous assignment), I became acquainted with a chaplain-sponsored program called "Personal Effectiveness Training." I knew this program was designed for better communication and problem-solving approaches at the company and battalion level. I also recalled the success of the P.E.T. program conducted by two very qualified chaplains who were group leaders and teachers of the project in our battalion in Europe. In that unit I had personally witnessed the improvement of communication at all levels. But that unit was combat ready. They had a sense of purpose—their overall morale was good. Could a Personal Effectiveness Program overcome the massive doses of apathy I found in my new command?

Through consultation with my own battalion chaplain and the 7th Division Chaplain I learned of an individual in the division whose specialized training might be helpful in dealing with our problems: Chaplain (CPT) C.D. Witmer, assigned to 2nd Brigade. I invited him to give me a briefing on how he might operate an effective P.E.T. program for our unit.

Chaplain Witmer outlined the basic components of a program as he envisioned it for the battalion. A portion of what he presented was similar to what I had experienced in Europe, but much of it covered areas of family and teenage behavior, concepts that were new to me. (That's why I would have to call the eventual program conducted in my battalion a new, leadership-oriented version of P.E.T.). During my conversation with Chaplain Witmer, I learned that he had taught many college and university classes on adolescent behavior, family problems, and methods of discipline. With the kind of personal problems we were experiencing, I was more than pleased to know his kind of help was available.

Training Format Selected to Focus on Unit Morale Problem Via Supervisors

At the conclusion of the briefing, I summarized my dilemma and needs and asked Chaplain Witmer how much time he needed to do the job in the most effective way possible. I liked his straightforward answer: "Sir, what you expect can't be accomplished in less than 30 hours of training for every NCO in your battalion—that is, if you're serious about dealing with the problems you've mentioned."

I watched my S-3 (training officer) gulp as I replied: "Chaplain you've got it!" I turned to the S-3 (who, I'm sure, had a project of between 4 and 8 hours per NCO in mind) and told him to work it out on our training schedule. I made sure he understood that this project had my highest priority.

My S-3 did an outstanding job. We had to develop this program out

of our own hide because no additional slack in tasking was offered by the Division planners. The chaplain insisted we needed to train all NCO's by command structure, using the NCO chain of command at the platoon level as the basic group training component. Further, Chaplain Witmer convinced me that, in order to emphasize the uniqueness and special opportunities of this training for professional development and personal growth, he needed to conduct the first all-day session for each training group completely away from the environment of the post. I, therefore, accepted the idea of a one-day retreat, off post, at a local retreat center (under contract to the chaplains at Ft. Ord). We agreed to split the cost of the retreats 50/50 between our training money and the chaplains' retreat funds. This meant we had to plan four separate retreats for 25 NCO's each, complete with bus transportation. Before each group left, I met with the NCO's and informed them of the scope of the P.E.T. training. I told them to relax and enjoy their day— I assured them that they would be learning something new!

At the conclusion of these one-day retreats I received a special report on the progress of the groups from the S-3, who was in close contact with Chaplain Witmer and our battalion chaplain (Chaplain [CPT] Temple G. Matthews, III). My S-3 reported: "Sir, the chaplains tell me the NCO's are really enjoying their training, but they're *mad!* They don't think they should be singled out for this training—as if all the problems of the battalion are their fault. They think every officer of the battalion should get the same training."

My first reaction was: "Good!" This meant the P.E.T. training was raising important issues with our NCO supervisors. Secondly, it seemed logical and fair that my officers and I also receive some form of training in these concepts. Chaplain Witmer, however, was merely on loan to us from the 2nd Brigade. I had to be careful not to extend his time with us since obviously he had his own duties to perform. But my S-3 informed me Chaplain Witmer had already cleared with his command and had recommended a one-day (6-8 hour) overbriefing of the major concepts being taught our NCO's to be presented to *all* the officers of the battalion. I readily concurred.

The P.E.T. training progressed for our NCO's at a normal pace with surprisingly few scheduling problems for all four training groups (two all-day and two half-day sessions for each group). But we had some real juggling to do as the time came closer to our special FTX (field training exercise) dates. We had to train one company of NCO supervisors ahead of all the others because they were to be involved in FTX's in Panama and Alaska. Our normal program for P.E.T. was set up for a nine-week period. As it got down to the wire for our participation in "Brave Shield XVI," (the Division's biggest FTX to date), we began to experience planning turbulence for several of our two-hour follow-up sessions planned as conclusions for each group. It was in the middle of the NCO training program (outlined above) that we were able to clear our schedules for the

one-day officer overbriefing.

Commander and Officers Learn Much from P.E.T. Over-briefing

Chaplain Witmer did an excellent job of presenting the major concepts of what he was teaching our NCO's during the briefing to officers of my command. I could tell the majority of my officers appreciated the training, but I choose to comment here on what *I,* as a commander, learned about myself through this one-day overbriefing.

First, the chaplain focused on the "Roots" of our problems with so many young soldiers today—namely, the lack of stability in their family of origin. He demonstrated how this lack of communication and mutual respect in the home eventually leads to lack of cooperation and motivation in the school setting. Consequently, an increasing number of soldiers come to us from civilian life unprepared to cope with stress and discipline. Finally, he introduced four "goals" of misbehavior. I found this exceedingly helpful because I could easily recognize such goals or patterns of behavior in operation in the lives of soldiers I had to discipline. From what my officers were saying, they also saw these patterns among troops they commanded.

During the one-day session, Chaplain Witmer also introduced a number of basic communication concepts. One particularly caught my attention. It emphasized encouragement as a means for gaining confidence and cooperation. The chaplain illustrated several mistaken methods supposedly designed to encourage people to work harder. Instead of stimulating work, these mistaken methods actually discourage the subordinate from further effort. His definition of the "stroke-kick" method of encouragement, for instance, really hit home! "Men, you've done an excellent job so far, but you have a long way to go yet. . . ." All the officers laughed spontaneously at that illustration. What the chaplain had done was to pinpoint *my* favorite way of encouraging people to greater goals. Now I could see it had the exact opposite effect. It actually discourages people from trying. I resolved at that point to avoid such "double message" sentences—to stick to compliments without strings attached whenever I wanted to thank people for a job well done.

As one of the aspects of the P.E.T. program for my battalion, Chaplains Witmer and Matthews promised a detailed after-action report of their work with the NCO's in my battalion. They promised to bring me their impressions of the strengths and weaknesses of my NCO chain-of-command as they observed individuals and groups interact. They also promised to give me accurate feedback of the NCO's perceptions of our battalion and how *they* saw the problems we all faced.

Even before I received that after-action report, numerous comments came to me indicating many NCO's were enjoying their P.E.T. training and learning new ways to deal with enlisted soldiers and their problems. I also

received reports that our NCO's particularly were glad to hear the officers were being scheduled to attend P.E.T. sessions as well. My S-3 told me that one E-5 had been so impressed with the P.E.T. training that he arranged to take his leave around his P.E.T. training group. Clearly, we were making progress!

Chaplain Feedback Provides Important Information

Chaplain Witmer and Chaplain Matthews visited me personally in order to hand-deliver their after-action report. It was several pages long and focused on roughly a half-dozen key issues brought up by the NCO's. The report was blunt and strongly worded. It pointed out some things about myself and my officers which were not easy to read. In essence, it stated that whenever there were foul-ups between line companies and planning staff, NCO's took it in the neck. While they thought their relationships with the troops were on a definite upswing as a result of their supervisory-P.E.T. training, they also insisted that if certain improvements weren't made in the management capabilities of the officer chain of command, NCO morale would plummet again. The report clearly stated that if I, the battalion commander, as the middle man in all this mess, didn't begin to show some sign of concern for the NCO's plight, then everything we gained in 9 weeks of P.E.T. training could be lost.

I shared this information with a few of my commanders and asked their feedback. I also began to single-out specific NCO's and talk more directly with them. (Both Chaplain Witmer and Chaplain Matthews concluded that, on the whole, the NCO's of the battalion were very dedicated, hard working professional soldiers. Only a few were "goof-offs" or people who showed little respect for the needs of the soldier and the battalion.) I began a personal campaign of working closely with key NCO's. The P.E.T. training and related problems of soldiers offered common ground for discussion. All the NCO's responded in a very positive way. In our planning stages for "Brave Shield XVI," I stressed the importance of teamwork and cooperation and my confidence that, as a group, we had the capacity to tackle any problem successfully. Then we packed up and moved out for the massive joint-services' desert exercise.

Unit Experiences Dramatic Change in Performance

For over six weeks, with just one company and a heavy equipment section (augmented by key headquarters' personnel), our battalion worked around the clock in the Mojave Desert during July and August 1977. With temperatures in excess of 120 degrees, amid sandstorms and other adverse tactical conditions, the men of my battalion kept all the supply roads and a major landing strip open. Our troops performed magnificently. Morale was sky high. Our performance merited special commendation from the 7th Division Commander. We had tackled the toughest of obstacles and had come through in superb fashion. At the conclusion of this enormous

undertaking, I addressed the assembled battalion and told them I was proud to command such a group of thorough professionals (and I didn't add a single "But . . ." to any of my remarks!).

Following "Brave Shield XVI," Chaplain Witmer conducted another 14 hours of Supervisory-leadership P.E.T. training for all my officers. He also conducted some make-up sessions for new NCO's assigned to the battalion since the original P.E.T. training. In addition, Chaplain Matthews, who had worked alongside Chaplain Witmer in all these sessions, began conducting P.E.T. sessions for our enlisted personnel. We sent over 100 through 12 hours of P.E.T. training in order for those soldiers to learn more about their own situations. I understand the discussions between the chaplain and those troops were very interesting, especially as these young soldiers came to grips with their own backgrounds and their various styles of cooperative or uncooperative behavior.

In less than 9 months after our desert exercise, our unit was again tasked to support a second major "Brave Shield" FTX—this time for the first division-wide maneuver since activitation. For this "Brave Shield," in February and March of 1978, all the resources of our entire battalion would be needed. Once again, our troops performed far above what anyone could expect. Our equipment never stopped running. Soldiers slept in shifts (some even had to be *ordered* to rest), but the work kept on. (Five of our soldiers received Army Commendation medals on the spot for their heroic rescue of four trapped airmen in a C-131 crash that hit within 200 meters of our battalion area.)

When I look at what I inherited and compare it to the conclusion of my command time—it almost sounds like a story-book ending. But it is real. Obviously, there were many factors involved and Supervisory P.E.T. training was not the only program we instituted to get at the root of our problems. Our people worked at numerous programs and projects. We sent dozens of NCO's and enlisted soldiers to leadership and management schools on post. We had the Organizational Effectiveness Evaluation Team from Division Headquarters survey our unit. But the one overall impression I am left with is that this chaplain-run program, especially with its unique aspects of first-line supervisory leadership skill training, stressing the dignity of each person and teaching basic counseling and communication techniques, was the *key* catalyst. It challenged the best from us all and played the major role in changing a battalion from a low-performance, low-morale group of soldiers into the best battalion in the 7th Infantry Division.

I am further pleased that our Commander, Major General Robert L. Kirwan, saw fit to reassign Chaplain Witmer to the Division Chaplain's Office where he was able to teach P.E.T. to all first-line supervisors in interested battalions throughout the division. Believe me, it's well worth every commander's time to investigate such a program for his own unit.

Confessions of a Messochist

Chaplain (LTC) Richard A. Brandt

Twice, I have had exceptionally fine and proud moments in my Army career. First was at Fort Slocum, New York, when Commandant James Wilson turned my belt buckle inside out at Saturday morning Basic Course inspection. The Brass was polished! "Very Good, Brandt" he commented, as the School Secretary, Chaplain (MAJ) Gerhardt Hyatt, stood by with the faithful clipboard. That should have been enough honor for any 2LT Staff Specialist to last a full career!

But a second moment, even greater was to take place years later, when I was a seasoned combat veteran and administrative chaplain (now politely called "Pastoral Coordinator"). The place was Fort Leonard Wood. The entire Post Chapel staff came together to surprise me with an inscribed gold plaque which read "MESSIEST DESK ON POST." It was a poignant experience, accepted with a moistening in my eyes and a lump in my throat. It was only countered as I looked into the many smirking faces and said to myself: "Oh, oh! They found me out!" (Incidently, I still have the plaque but have not been able to locate it recently.)

I have always been *messy.* My mother gave up my neatness lessons in tears by the time I reached fifth grade. I have been the despair of hard core supervisory chaplains, waiting with drumming fingers on the autovon while I frantically tried to find some famous report. Secretaries have written me anonymous threatening notes. Janitors, surveying my office, have laughed or cried in my presence. My more sensitive peers have tactfully suggested that we meet in "their" office as "there seems to be more room." Even my suffering spouse and best friend, Gail, still calls and says "Where did you put the kids' shot records *this* time?" Frankly, I couldn't even use a "barrel sermon" because I didn't know where the old ones were. (I knew I had them though.)

It had not dawned on me, however, until Fort Leonard Wood, that this behavior was unusual. I believed everyone, in their heart at least, was or wanted to be messy.

Chaplain Brandt, a clergyman of the American Lutheran Church, is currently assigned as Assistant Staff Chaplain, Health Services Command, Fort Sam Houston, Texas. Prior to that assignment he served on the Staff and Faculty of the US Army Chaplain Center and School.

The final blow was yet to come. After wading through my son's room, cluttered with land crabs, a 2-year supply of *Mad* magazines, and broken model airplanes, it occurred to me. This kid is messy! I stated that fact to him. His reply: "I just wanted to be like you, Dad." The light had dawned!

Completely devastated and humbled, I decided to take the cure. I sought professional advice. I went to a friend, an executive in the electric power industry. His desk was always neat and clean. "It's simple," he said. "I put everything left-over from the day in my desk drawer." The trouble was he had a huge walnut desk with a cavernous drawer. I only had a gray single pedestal, Army desk with a Federal Stock Number, a "teetering leg," a mini drawer, and a missing hand receipt.

Unfulfilled, I went to my peers next. Chaplain Del Gremmels, that organized person, said, "It's simple! What you don't use in one calendar year, either throw or give away. Keep the rest of the stuff in a cardboard box." I was impressed. Even *I* could do that. I tried. Before long, however, I discovered that I was searching for larger and larger boxes. New neighbors were warned about "that guy who will come over while you are unpacking household goods and ask for your empty boxes, especially if they hold pianos or freezers."

I had received no help from professionals or peers. Even my bosses didn't play parent by telling me to "clean up or clear out." I knew then that I must grimly lick this on my own.

My first attempt, abortive as it was, called for a "fail safe" filing system for important papers. I worked hard to develop it. It took a week and $3.29 to the PX for colored tabs. It was beautiful. A work of art. I considered a patent. Unfortunately, so much work stacked up on my desk while I was designing it, that I never got a chance to try it out! (I still have it, though I have not seen it recently.) But the skids were yet to come. . . .

I got a job at the US Army Chaplain Center and School. It was *Messochist Heaven!* I lost all reason after I discovered several empty desks near my area stall. Sense left me. I claimed these desks and soon filled them with paper. I began demanding and appropriating more desks, quickly filling them up and moving on to the next. My appetite became voracious. No DF, DA Pamphlet, or publishing house Christmas card was too insignificant for "future use." I was so obsessed that I did not realize how public a matter it had become, until one day when I had to sign off on a staff request for "Concertina Wire." The stated purpose was to prevent "unauthorized persons" from using "her desk." I also heard dark mutterings about securing "attack dogs" to guard the area.

Finally, a kindly old Catholic Chaplain, Tom Downes, told me: "Look! You have been fighting being a mess for over 40 years. Why not accept your messiness and enjoy it!" What a *relief!* Tremendous burdens fell from my shoulders. It was sort of OK to be messy. Strangely enough, I became a little better organized, less obsessive, and was even observed throwing away a Sunday Chapel Bulletin. (Though I must confess that I

stuck one away in my suit pocket because it had a really neat format that I might want to use someday.)

I am still a mess and will probably always be one, and will still admire the organized ones among us. I do know that, though the Army has only honored me *twice* (Ft. Slocum and Ft. Leonard Wood), it has, in its infinite wisdom made me an Admin' Chaplain *thrice*. I can only conclude that the Army wishes to remedially train me or that supervisors know instictively that they will never get hung for a missed suspense date because no one would ever find the evidence.

I also know that I am not the only Messochist in the world. Chaplain Danny Burtram has put me in touch with a successful Washington, D.C., professor who is one. Chaplain George Stuebben sent me a news clipping about a Napa, California, City Manager who will need a shovel to clean his office when he retires. I think there are many of us in the branch who secretly belong to the fraternity, albeit in discomfort.

Most important (you knew the sermon was coming) I have found in the past 20 years that the private lives of troubled soldiers and families are often messy. The BCT Trainee wanting to go home to his girlfriend, the young couple desperately trying to make a "go" of marriage, and the mother trying to settle her kids while dad is on short tour, all have "messiness" in common.

Helpful pastoral counseling can be more helpful when we accept the messiness of many lives. A "messy overlay" can assist us in de-emphasizing the "Why did you get in this mess?" and spend more time on understanding, forgiveness, and encouragement. The recognition of "messiness" can help us de-emphasize professional jargon, keep us from over-reliance on "clean" technique, and be more spontaneous with the person. It is a learning moment when we realize that our personal "messiness" is not so far removed from those with whom we minister, even if lives are fouled by destructive behavior and immaturities. The recognition of "messiness" can protect us from simplistic and hasty assessments and probably keep us from taking ourselves too seriously.

So, if you are *not* a "messochist," enjoy it! If you *are,* accept it, and you will most often find that your organizational skills and attitudes improve. That is my hope for you and me.

(By the way, please don't lose this article. I had planned to make a carbon copy but could not locate the ream that I have saved since Fort Hood days. I know it's here someplace though.)

Book Reviews

Stand Fast in Faith

Wallace E. Fisher

Abingdon, Nashville, TN; 1978

Are you deeply troubled by the current moral confusion in our country? Do you suffer as you see so many giving allegiance to false gods? Does it bother you to witness the growing numbers who run after foolish philosophies, fad psychologies, the occult? If you reply affirmatively to such questions, this is a book for you, especially you as parent, teacher, pastor, public leader.

Dr. Fisher makes an extended plea for facing up to the "awesome loss of moral constancy in the Western world" from either a religious point of view or "a basic moral perspective." He uses the Ten Commandments "as the foundation for the beginnings of this reappraisal in the church as well as the world." He views the Commandments as primarily given "to persuade [people] that they need God and to correct, enlighten, and guide them for responsible living in society." He deplores the "shallow view of sin" entertained by "most Americans, inside and outside the church," which hinders discernment of "every human's desperate need for God's grace." He writes for those "who want to get themselves together, to become authentic persons, to live responsibly, to care about persons . . ." and who will not give in to the current fashions in lifestyle.

He begins with a sweeping description of the modern moral confusion that results from "failure to bring freedom and discipline into personal and social equilibrium." Lacking a commonly accepted set of values, of "working priorities that guide one's life in the world," Western society chooses increasing freedom and decreasing discipline, both "external and internal." This is documented by numerous references to literary, philosophical, and historical writings and/or statements. The case concerning "moral chaos" and its basic causes is carefully delineated; so is the case against all of the popular remedies for such chaos. The author concludes that "God commands because he cares," and "The Commandments are the 'new morality' in our era," defining "[the] moral order, . . . the reason for doing social justice, and [enabling] us to articulate [the moral order] in judicial terms."

Such an approach naturally "raises the question of authority," which for Americans is a thorny problem because "they are an undisciplined people" that has little respect for authority. But if God's authority is not "recognized, acknowledged, and acted on, freedom is no more than a word . . ., an idea . . ., a concept . . ., a reality to be denied." We all "need the freedom that . . . acknowledgement of the authority of God can guarantee." And the first three of the Commandments "offer a disciplined way to connect with that authority," underscoring the sovereignty of God and calling "people to obedience in freedom as their right relationship with God"; they "define every human's proper exercise of freedom as the acceptance of God's sovereign authority and active trust in his parental love."

Having established his point that "The first three commandments point up the dynamic for a new morality for twentieth-century humans," the author goes on to an examination of "God's mandates for doing this new morality in the family, the community of neighbors, and the complex community of classes, nations, and races." Commandments four (honoring

parents and respecting traditions) and eight (speaking falsely to or about others) are considered in a chapter about "Where Responsible Relationships Begin"; not unexpectedly, they begin at home, in the "teaching-sharing-correcting-forgiving relationship between parents and children in which attitudes are taught and caught . . . ." The vital business of "Fashioning a Stable Society" is concerned with the commandments about killing, stealing, and committing adultery. These "call humans to live responsibly with one another," that is, in a society in which "persons are valued above property, property rights are respected, and sex is viewed as a splendid gift from God to be enjoyed in the humane context of commitment, trust, and responsibility." They are essential strands in the "new morality" over against "the present climate of libertinism and social irresponsibility, when each does what he or she wants to do without regard for others." The ninth and tenth commandments "focus on envy," according to the author, because "covetousness, like greed and jealousy, roots in envy." These two commandments concern "our *attitudes* toward other persons"; all the rest focus on relationships, on actions, "but these two forbid a state of mind."

Following extended examination of the Commandments as "those disciplines without which the good life is impossible and apart from which we shall not work long nor well for a just society here," there is a chapter entitled "How One Man Got Freedom and Discipline in Balance." This concerns Jesus of Nazareth, who "fulfilled God's moral law demonstrating what God intends humans to be and liberating them to become 'little Christs.'" To summarize how this was accomplished there is an examination of "the Palm Sunday story" and the offering of Jesus as the paradigm for the "proper balance between freedom and discipline." The author concludes that "we *are* fashioned for freedom and that in Christ we can learn to exercise it responsibly."

Wallace E. Fisher is pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Holy Trinity in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. He has been a college professor of history (1947-52) and college chaplain. He has been in his current pastorate since 1952 and has become an acknowledged authority on parish renewal; he speaks at more than a hundred conferences annually and has several books to his credit.

—— WILLIAM E. PAUL, JR.

Creative Ministry

Henri J. M. Nouwen

Image Books, Doubleday and Company, Garden City, NY; 1978

"The main concern of this book is the relationship between professionalism and spirituality in the ministry." The author addresses the vital question of what lies beyond professionalism that makes the minister's work more than "just another specialty in the many helping professions." By analyzing "the five main functions of the ministry — teaching, preaching, individual pastoral care, organizing, and celebrating," he seeks to show "the seeds of a spirituality for every man and woman who wants to be of service." Since "every Christian is a minister," the book is essentially "about the life-style of every Christian."

Teaching is "the most universal and most appreciated role of the Christian ministry through the ages . . . ." And it is not "the content of teaching [but] the teaching relationship" that is "the most important factor in the ministry of teaching." From such a perspective the author asks a rhetorical question: "What do those who call themselves teachers or students really claim to be when they look at themselves in the light of the Gospel of Jesus Christ?" In response, he describes "two basic models of teaching — the violent model and the redemptive model" and then "the main resistances of man against learning." Teaching in the context of preparing students to go out and tame a hostile world forces the teacher "into a process which by its nature is competitive, unilateral, and alienating. In short: violent." In the redemptive

model, "the form of the teaching can be described as evocative, bilateral, and actualizing." After a discussion of these alternatives in some depth, the matter of "resistance against learning" is considered. Here the term "scotosis," from the Greek *skotos*, is introduced; Nouwen borrows it from Bernard Lonergan to represent the "exclusion of painful insights" which renders many students "like unengaged spectators in the procession of life." Only when students and teachers experience "a conversion that calls for a 'kenotic' self-encounter" can there be freedom for real learning.

The purpose of preaching, according to Nouwen, is to help persons come to the basic insight that "they can be free to follow Christ: that is, to live their lives as authentically as he lived his." Unfortunately, "indifference and irritation [are] obstacles that prevent the Word of God from falling on fertile ground," and these really revolve around "the spirituality of the preacher." The message itself and the preacher comprise "two of the main difficulties in preaching," and the author considers these in three subsections: "1) The problem of the message"; "2) The problem of the messenger"; and "3) The man who can lead to insight." The latter is one able to "endure the hardship of preaching and lead . . . people through . . . darkness to the light of God."

In the chapter that follows, the author strives to "show the implications of individual pastoral care for the personal life of the minister himself"; again, the necessity for moving "beyond professionalism" and becoming "a faithful witness of God's covenant" is emphasized. Another chapter focuses on the ministerial/priestly role as "agents of change" and "the relationship between spirituality and organization," the business of becoming "a catalyst . . . [one] who can uncover the hidden potentials of his community and channel them into creative social action," always aware of the words of Revelation 21:5, "I am making the whole of creation new." (Jerusalem Bible) A fifth chapter deals with the minister as vocationally committed to making it "possible for man not only to fully face his human situation but also to celebrate it in all its awesome reality."

The final segment of the book is entitled "Conclusion," in which Jesus' words in Saint John 15:13 about there being no greater love than laying down one's life for one's friends are regarded as summarizing "the meaning of all Christian ministry." The implications of Jesus' words are examined against a recognition of the need for rediscovery of "the transcending power of the spiritual life by which man is able to stand strong even when surrounded by shifting ideologies, crumbling political, social, and religious structures, and a constant threat of war and total destruction." This "is a way that requires ministry" by persons eminently qualified in professional ways but also able to transcend these "in the conviction that the Spirit moves beyond professional expertise." It is a way that "calls for ministers in the true sense, who lay down their own lives for their friends . . . . It calls for creative weakness." An "Epilogue" indicates that "the conclusion of this book does not want to suggest the end of a discussion but the beginning of one." A few unanswered questions raised by those who read the chapters prior to publication help to underline this discussion aspect.

This is "a very personal book . . . an attempt to articulate ideas and feelings about the ministry based on the ups and downs of [Nouwen's] own experiences." That lends appeal and authenticity to what is said; there is little provocation here, in the sense of any adversary relationship. For chaplains, there is lots of solid food for thought and reflection regarding a transformation and redemption of their individual ministries by the Spirit of Christ. The work provides a needed corrective and/or balance for the increasing emphasis on professionalism in today's chaplaincy, often at the expense of needed spiritual growth and insight.

Henri J.M. Nouwen is a Catholic priest, a widely known author and lecturer, and writer of at least nine excellent books.

—— WILLIAM E. PAUL,, JR.

The Teachings of Seventh-Day Adventism
The Teachings of Jehovah's Witnesses
The Teachings of Mormonism
The Teachings of Christian Science

John H. Gerstner

Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI; 1978

This series of four booklets originally appeared as successive chapters in Professor Gerstner's book, *The Theology of the Major Sects*, printed in 1960 by the same publisher.

Each booklet is arranged in the same format: An introduction; a description and history of the sect; a more detailed doctrinal exposition, with cited references; a glossary of terms and words; a bibliography; a "Summary of Traditional Christian Doctrines"; and a page of "Brief Definitions of the Sects," with a comparison chart in matrix form.

Each of the booklets is "designed as a ready reference ... a quick guide to the wealth of literature on [its] subject ...." The word "sect" is defined "from the evangelical perspective," and refers to "those denominations which do not hold to fundamental biblical principles — especially the deity of Christ and his atonement." The summary of traditional Christian teachings "is included to provide a basis for comparison ... to be used as a frame of reference."

The series makes available to chaplains a compact, easily transportable set of guides and sources regarding the specific groups considered. The format offers solid help with unexpected questions from whatever source; it also lends itself to use in group discussions.

John H. Gerstner is Professor of Church History at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pennsylvania. In addition to his book on major sects he is the author of *Reasons for Faith*.

—— WILLIAM E. PAUL, JR.

Jonah: Church in Revolt

Hans Walter Wolff

Clayton Publishing House, Saint Louis, MO; 1978

This little paperback — 78 pages — is a didactic expository piece on the little "Book of Jonah." According to the "Editor's Foreword," it concerns "the different kinds of freedom which are possible in our lives" when the freedom of God ... catches and overpowers" us.

Dr. Wolff views the text of "Jonah" as "A Drama in Five Acts." Act I concerns "Commission and escape"; Act II, "Jonah's fear of God and the sailors' fear of God"; Act III, "Turn-about and new commission"; Act IV, "Jonah's sermon, Ninevah's about-face, and God's commission"; and Act V, "Jonah's anger and God's compassion." Beneath each of the five headings are listed the cast of characters, the place, and the scripture references. The text is apparently a German translation by the writer of the book further translated into English. The exposition/commentary that follows was originally delivered as a series of lectures at Concordia Seminary in Exile and Eden Theological Seminary in Saint Louis. It is presented in three parts, namely, "The Messenger Who Refused," "The Messenger Who Obeyed," and "The Messenger Who Grumbled."

Wolff finds in the first sixteen verses of the first chapter of "Jonah" three different kinds of freedom: "the freedom which man extorts for himself," illustrated by Jonah's attempt to be free of the mission God assigns him; "the freedom in which God catches up with [Jonah]," reflected in the storm sequence that leads him to offer his life to still the storm; and,

"the freedom which man experiences when God liberates him," that is, the freeing of the sailors from "fear of the elements to thankfulness and the fear of the Lord." The latter "journey" is examined in a section entitled "The Stages of Fear," a study of "the key word 'to fear,' "; it is followed by an exhortation to acknowledge God's freedom and "dedicate [ourselves] to his gracious will."

"The Messenger Who Obeyed" considers Jonah 1:17 to 2:10, and 3:1-10. Here the commentator finds "three different types of 'conversion,'" that is, "Jonah's turn-around," then "Ninevah's about-face," and finally "God's new start." God's freedom "to make an about-face," declares Wolff, is dominated by compassion. "The real theme of our lives . . . and the life of our world . . . is God's turning away from severity to compassion, from well-deserved death to the new gift of life."

"The Messenger Who Grumbled" concerns Jonah 4:1-11, containing Jonah's angry reaction to God's compassion, a reflection of ourselves "in the mirror of this book"; it also recounts God's continued pursuit of Jonah, but leaves the outcome unresolved; and, "God's great closing question [which] interconnects everything we should glean from the book of Jonah." Three main lessons are discerned from the story of Jonah: God loves and cares lovingly for "people who stand quite far removed from us politically, socially, or religiously"; second, "God's heart is stirred by the gigantic crowds in his creation"; and third, "God desires our agreement, given completely freely, to his worldwide compassion, to his lifesaving work in the world," an agreement given in terms of "word and action."

The entire exposition/commentary is liberally laced with the specifically Christian insights of the author. He is interested in what the story of Jonah has to say regarding certain "aspects of the contemporary task facing the Church," as the publisher's blurb puts it; he wants to help the Church "share more wisely in God's compassionate mission to humanity." For Christian chaplains, this is a book of fresh discernments into the biblical story of Jonah as well as a wonderful example of exegesis and its application to sermon preparation; there is also, of course, a profound message here for the individual reader.

Dr. Hans Wolff is a professor at the University of Tübingen and a widely known Old Testament expositor. He has two other books published in English, a commentary on "Hosea" (1974) and another on "Joel and Amos" (1977).

<div align="right">WILLIAM E. PAUL, JR.</div>

A Manual On Preaching

Milton Crum, Jr.

Judson Press, Valley Forge, PA; 1977

"Milton Crum has broken new ground in the literature of preaching. He has taken seriously the difficulty of moving from the text to the sermon and, with remarkable clarity, has offered concrete help to the learner." William D. Thompson, Professor of Preaching, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, begins his "Preface" to this book with those highly laudatory words. A careful reading of the work serves to corroborate that opinion.

The author's stated purpose is "to assist preachers in actually doing preaching" with a manual that is "unashamedly a how-to-do-it book." Thus the whole thing is organized like a textbook, with chapter headings, synopses, subheadings, footnotes at the end of the volume, just before the "Index," and two appendixes that provide a checklist and a very selective bibliography. All of this enhances the usefulness of the work as the successive steps in the process occur.

The specific method of sermon development is comprised of "Scripture as a

prerequisite," a "story-like structure of the sermon," and attention to "Dynamic Factors which facilitate the movement" of the listener, including the preacher, "in heart and mind." Each of the components of this method is given attention, and "follows a progression from the more concrete to the more conceptual." Several parts present "detailed accounts of a thought process for developing sermons" in order to assist the preacher in adapting the method to personal needs. Throughout the book there is no equivocation about its purpose: "A manual is for *doing* as well as for reading."

The dust jacket blurb states that "The author draws upon the best in biblical interpretation, human psychology, and communications theory to help the preacher . . . ." There are many usefull insights and fresh ideas presented along with the instruction regarding preparation and development of the sermon The author is acutely aware of the sometimes onerous burden of filling with words "that empty 'space' in thought and time" that is experienced when the next sermon must be prepared. His idea of "thinking of preaching as telling a story" that begins, moves along, has a happening, and then stops, is an ancient one that needs the renewed emphasis it receives in this book.

Any chaplain who takes preaching seriously ought to have this book and *use* it, regardless of length of service. It can produce noticeable improvement regarding "the power of preaching to move people" that the world always urgently needs. It can have a profound influence on "the effects of the liturgy of the gathered church in the liturgy of the scattered church," indeed.

Milton Crum, Jr., is Howard Chandler Robbins Professor of Homiletics at the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia. He is a graduate of the University of Nebraska and the School of Theology of the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee. He is also a diplomate of Saint Augustine's College in Canterbury, England, and holds a Certificate from the Preacher's Institute of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. He has a number of published articles on homiletics to his credit. He has served as rector of a church near the Seminary at which he teaches, and as a university chaplain.

——WILLIAM E. PAUL, JR.

Preaching Law and Gospel

Herman G. Stuempfle, Jr.

Fortress Press, Philadelphia, PA; 1978

This is *not* a book about "the sermon as sermon." It *is* a book about "discerning the theological realities which undergird our own work . . . a certain theological substructure which is indispensable" to the creating of sermons.

The author asserts that "*some* theology will surface in every sermon," and there is danger that "without prior reflection, uncorrected by the great tradition in which all of us preachers stand . . . ," the results may be a distortion or subversion of "the distinctive Word we are called to proclaim." Subjected to "theological analysis," some of our former sermons might astonish us by revealing that "we have been purveying such strange doctrines as the perfectibility of man and society in history, the immortality of the soul, or the demand to justify oneself before God by moral or spiritual achievement."

Two contemporary homiletical writers are put forward as having "particularly useful schematizations which can serve as a framework for theological reflection on our task." One is Kyle Haselden, whose threefold schema "is inductive in nature, taking its cues from the examination of a large body of sermonic material"; the other is Heinrich Ott, whose "analysis of the theological substructure of the sermon . . . " begins with the three main parts of the Heidelberg Catechism. Both writers are seen as "rooted in the classic theology of the

Reformation . . . " and its "familiar . . . categories of Law and Gospel."

Luther's "doctrine of the twofold form of the word of God" is very succinctly examined. For him, "God speaks as both the God of wrath and the God of mercy . . . exercising through wrath and judgment his 'alien work' and through grace and forgiveness his 'proper work.'" The reformer's constant emphasis on "the Word preached from a human mouth to a living congregation" is also noted; such "oral proclamation of the sermon is the means by which God addresses persons in the present moment with both" Law and Gospel. That accounts for the importance for preachers of clearly "distinquishing between Law and Gospel," difficult as this task may be, since the two are "separable in terms of theological analysis [yet] very closely joined in experience."

There follows an extended discussion of "two modes of preaching Law," i.e., as "hammer of judgment," in which "the Word of God confronts us as accuser," and the proper correlate is "the Gospel proclaimed as forgiveness, or justification . . . "; and, as "mirror of existence," in which "the Law functions . . . as a threat which rises from within the actualities of life," but for which "no single word or phrase can characterize the Gospel," thus making preaching more difficult. As "hammer," the Law in preaching focuses on conscience; as "mirror," it focuses more on awakening consciousness.

To assist in meeting the difficulties of preaching Law in the "mirror" mode, the author presents the idea of "the Gospel as antiphon to existence," in which content is "qualified but not determined by the specific aspect of the human condition which the Law as 'mirror' has reflected." In other words, "Just as in our preaching of Law we 'mirror' certain negative aspects of our common humanity, so in our proclamation of the Gospel we are to respond antiphonally with appropriate affirmations." Four thematic elements are paired and illustrated, that is, four sets of "reflections of the human condition" over against "antiphonal phrasings of the Gospel [expressed] in contemporary theology and preaching." The four are "alienation and reconciliation, anxiety and certitude, despair and hope, transiency and homecoming." These are not the only motifs, and "it becomes our task when we preach to match articulations of Law as 'mirror' and Gospel as 'antiphon' as sensitively and precisely as we can." It is also important here to "avoid the false promise that the Gospel resolves the tensions or removes the contradictions of existence"; it is essential that we "help our hearers see how the Gospel makes healing, hope, and certitude possible while their contraries are unabatedly present."

The problem of preaching "the Gospel of free grace" and neglecting "the quality of life that issues from it" is considered under the heading, "The Call to Obedience." Here the author delves into the matter of "whether there is a basis . . . for any positive word about the content of the life of [the] new man in Christ." He examines Luther's position regarding "good works" and concludes that the reformer is indeed "concerned for the quality of life which faith produces"; however, Luther also "recognizes the need . . . to incite the Christian to side with the Spirit in its continual struggle against the flesh." In light of all this, the modern preacher dare not neglect the "divine 'ought' addressed to [each Christian] in each concrete situation," that is, "the call to obedience." A set of three "guidelines" follows for such preaching, illustrated by excerpts from actual sermons.

The final chapter, "Law and Gospel in the Sermon," begins with a warning against the risk of viewing "the categories of Law, Gospel, and the call to obedience . . . as having a relative independence of each other . . . discrete componants which need only to be inserted into the sermon at the proper place." That would be a distorted viewpoint, for the three categories "move within each sermon in lively, unpredictable ways." The process of sermon preparation "is an interplay of three living realities — the Word, the congregation, and the preacher . . . . Each sermon with its particular Law/Gospel configuration is a fourth living reality generated by the other three." This concept is explicated at length and then illustrated by specific examples of the author's preparation of two sermons for two different congregations.

This brief (95 pages) paperback about the theological content of preaching is a much needed contribution to what the author calls "the continuing renewal of the pulpit." Christian chaplains, like all Christian clergy, need to keep their theological ducks in order, faithful to the

long tradition to which they belong. This volume is a needed help toward such a goal. It is urgently recommended reading.

Herman G. Stuempfle, Jr., is President of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. He is editor of "Preaching in the Witnessing Community" and a writer in the "Proclamation" series.

——WILLIAM E. PAUL, JR.

Change of Address

Name _____

New Address _____

_____

Old Address _____

_____

_____

Send to: Military Chaplains' Review
US Army Chaplain Board
Fort Wadsworth, SI, New York 10305

_____

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

BERNARD W. ROGERS
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

Official:

J. C. PENNINGTON
Major General, United States Army
The Adjutant General

Distribution:
Special